DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 305 FL 002 098

AUTHOR	Nason, Gerald, Ed.
TITLE	Teaching Modern Languages.
INSTITUTION	Canadian Teachers' Federation, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE	Nov 63
NOTE	183p.; Report of a seminar held November 21-23, 1963 in Ottawa, Canada
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports, Educational Improvement, Instructional Materials, Instructional Program Divisions, International Education, *Language Instruction, *Language Programs, *Modern Languages, *Program Development, Programed Instruction, Program Evaluation, Second Language Learning, Tables (Data), Teacher Education, Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A review of a three-day conference on language teaching policies, methods, instructional materials, and teacher training in Canada is presented in this report. Articles and commentary focus on: (1) Canada's needs in language teaching, (2) language programs in the United Kingdom, United States, and the Soviet Union, (3) research in teaching methodology, (4) applied linguistics, and (5) the language laboratory, programed instruction, and television. Observations concerning the Ottawa, St. Cloud, and Tan Gau methods demonstrated at the conference are noted. Suggestions to improve language programs in specific areas are summarized. A final section on programs in Canadian schools includes tables on enrollment, language offerings, requirements, scheduling, teacher certification, and methods. A list of participants and observers concludes the report. (RL)

ED0 46305

teaching modern languages

l'enseignement des langues modernes

unterricht moderner sprachen

ensenando lenguas modernas

obuchenie sovremennim yazikam

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL002098

THE REPORT OF A SEMINAR CONVENED
IN THE INTERESTS OF EDUCATION BY
THE CANADIAN TEACHERS' FEDERATION

1

ED0 46305

SEMINAR REPORT

TEACHING MODERN LANGUAGES

Chateau Laurier, Ottawa
November 21-23, 1963

SEMINAR CHAIRMAN

Gerald Nason

ADVISORY GROUP

Miss Florence Bradford, Ottawa
Miss Lorraine LeBlanc, Moncton
Harvey R. Barnes, Vancouver
Andre Douesnard, Montreal

SPECIAL CONSULTANT

Professor William Mackey, Faculty of Letters, Laval University

FORWARD

Bilingualism is in the air in Canada.

Long before the current furore about bilingualism, however, teachers across the country were concerned over some of the problems of modern language teaching.

CTF's Board of Directors shared this concern - and decided to devote its 1963 National Seminar to exploring these problems on a wider and deeper scale.

The Seminar was held in November 1962 and lasted three days. Following the pattern established in earlier seminars,* about 70 participants were invited from different parts of the country. These were people with different educational backgrounds and experiences, representing several national organizations with a direct interest in this vital topic, as well as people from the teachers' organizations in all 10 provinces.

Originally, we had planned to call this Seminar "Teaching a Second Language". Upon reflection, however, we realized that this was not quite accurate; many students are learning more than one modern language. Thus, our title was changed to "Teaching Modern Languages".

There were no formal resolutions. Instead, participants agreed upon certain "conclusions" regarding language teaching, and wished also to go on record with a major "opinion" and a "suggestion".

Professor William Mackey, of the Faculty of Letters at Laval University, was the Seminar consultant, and to him we express our warmest thanks for his advice and guidance, his provocative opening address which set the "scene" for our Seminar, and his masterly evaluation at the end.

For the convenience of readers, the "conclusions" together with Professor Mackey's summary and evaluation, are placed in Section A of this report. Section B contains the addresses and their discussions, in chronological order.

We know that our two previous National Seminars stimulated further exploration at the provincial and local levels. It is our hope that this report will serve to stimulate similar discussions about the problems of modern language teaching.

Gerald Nason, Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Teachers' Federation, and Seminar Chairman.	M. Patricia Maybury, President, Canadian Teachers' Federation

* CTF Seminar on New Thinking in School Mathematics, April 1960

CTF Seminar on Programmed Learning - and its Future in Canada, November 1961.

CONTENTS

SECTION A	9	
Conclusions	11	
Suggestion	13	
Opinion	13	
Evaluation	15	
SECTION B	19	
Today's Demands on Modern Language Teaching	21	Prof. William Mackey
Additional Points	33	Prof. Mackey
Current Programs in Modern Language Teaching		
- The United Kingdom	35	Arthur J. Montague, OBE
- The United States	41	Dr. Joseph C. Hutchinson
- The U.S.S.R.	47	John E. R. Lloyd
Questions and Answers	53	Mr. Lloyd and Dr. Hutchinson
- Belgium	55	Etienne Harford
- France	59	François Weymuller
(English Text)	67	François Weymuller
- Canada	75	Harvey R. Barnes
Research Perspectives on Modern Language Teaching	83	Dr. R. C. Gardner
Questions and Answers	99	Dr. Gardner
Applied Linguistics -- and what it means for language teachers	101	Prof. Jean-Paul Vinay
Questions and Answers	113	Prof. Vinay
The Ottawa Demonstration	119	Miss Florence Bradford
The St. Cloud Demonstration	122	Miss Jeanette Hulek
The Tan Gau Demonstration	123	Dr. Robert Gauthier

CONTENTS

The Language Laboratories - An Appraisal 127 Prof. Andre Rigault
Questions and Answers 137 Prof. Rigault

Programmed Instruction and TV - in Language Teaching 139 Dr. E. N. Wright
Questions and Answers 148 Dr. Wright

Group Discussions 151
What needs to be done about Modern Language courses in the schools? 153 Roger Malboeuf
154 C. T. Teakle
154 Mrs. Marjorie Dover

Panel

What needs to be done about Texts, Testing and Teacher Training? 157 Miss Florence Bradford
159 Harvey R. Barnes
161 Dr. Floyd Robinson

Group Discussions

What needs to be done about Texts, Testing and Teacher Training? 165 Roger Malboeuf
166 C. T. Teakle
167 Mrs. Marjorie Dover

SECTION C

Modern Language Programs in Canadian Schools 171 Research Division, Canadian Teachers' Federation

Tables 175
Participants 191
Observers 197

6, 7, 8, 9

SECTION A

Conclusions 11

Suggestion 13

Opinion 13

Evaluation 15

CONCLUSIONS

1. Language Teaching

    (a) Every child should be taught a second language.

    (b) Language training should begin as early as possible in the elementary school with attention being paid to the development of positive attitudes.

2. Testing

    Examinations should reflect more adequately our declared interest in the place of audio-visual and audio-lingual teaching in the language program.

3. Textbooks

    (a) Textbooks should be more consistent with the audio-visual and audio-lingual approach to language teaching.

    (b) There is a need for articulation and integration of textbooks so that there will be a smooth transition from level to level within the school system.

4. Teacher Training

    (a) More special training is needed during the preparation of language teachers at all levels.

    (b) These programs for modern language teachers should include attention to the languages themselves, methods of teaching languages, the use of laboratory equipment and other aids, and linguistics.

    (c) In view of the extreme shortage of capable language teachers in Canada, special measures such as summer schools and other courses should be made available.

    (d) Inter-provincial exchanges between teachers in French-speaking Canada and those in non-French-speaking areas should continue to be promoted; also, international exchanges of teachers should be encouraged.

12 - 13

A SUGGESTION

Textbooks

Books used for the teaching of French should give attention both to stories and material with a French-Canadian as well as a French background; also books for the teaching of English in French-speaking schools should give attention to English-Canadian settings.

AN OPINION

Language Teaching

Following discussion about the amount and type of language training to be given to children, participants agreed to enter the following OPINION in this Report:

"While all children should receive language training, there was an expression of opinion by some participants that they should be streamed in language classes according to their ability. This is a major question, however, and is being left for others to pursue."

SUMMARY and EVALUATION

by
Professor W.F. Mackey
Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Letters
Laval University

For a summary and evaluation we have very few minutes indeed and, since we must finish on time to catch our respective planes or trains for home, I do promise to be brief.

First for the SUMMARY. In the three days we have been together we have spent about one day on language teaching policies, one day on language teaching methods and one day on materials and teacher training.

On language teaching POLICIES we got a good sample of what was being done in Canada and abroad, but only some hints of what should be done. When listening to what was being done abroad we could not help comparing it with what we know to be the situation in Canada, and we saw that we were far surpassed by Great Britain and France in their requirements and training of language teachers, not comparable to the Soviet Union in language specialization teaching skill and general enthusiasm for language learning, inferior to Belgium in the number of compulsory languages we teach, and unequal to the U.S.A. in the sense of urgency to learn languages and in per capita expenditure on language teaching.

Most of our provinces do not require a modern language and no special training is needed in teaching one. The fact that some provinces refer to a certified teacher who happens to be teaching a language as a qualified language teacher is indicative of how far we still have to go. While other countries have their national associations of language teaching specialists, this country does not. Nor does it have representatives at international meetings of such bodies.

If one thing has become evident at this Seminar, it is the urgent need to find some formula which would permit language teachers in different parts of the country to exchange information.

As for what might be done, we were invited to consider the importance of ethnic attitudes in language learning and the possibility of exploiting the special language learning aptitudes of certain individuals. We have seen that, since in many areas of this so-called bilingual country a single language has the status of the language, much should be done at the local level to convert it into the more realistic status of a language by promoting the official use of a second language -- written or oral -- as a symbol of national solidarity.

If our policies are behind the times, what about our METHODS? We considered these from the points of view of content and techniques. We saw how a theoretical and practical training in linguistics could change the content of our methods. But we soon realized that this new science of applied linguistics was really the old and neglected science of practical phonetics with a wider horizon and a theoretical basis. We saw in it many things that competent language teachers have been doing for ages without benefit of jargon.

As for the TECHNIQUES, it is significant that every one considered was exclusively oral -- whether it was that of the language laboratory, the look-and-listen, or the listen-and-repeat technique.

We all agreed that to be up-to-date we needed the hardware, but we were not too sure what sort. Yet some sort of recording machine seemed indispensable. We seemed to applaud all the demonstrations but not for the same reasons. We were not agreed on the significance of these demonstrations. Some of us thought we were looking at something new. Others were sure they had seen the same thing 20 years ago.

The use of TV techniques and programmed learning seemed to us to be in their infancy. The wide misuse of TV being traced to the lack of understanding of the character and capacity of the medium and programmed learning being diverted back to the language laboratory where it has long been at home under another name.

As for the ACHIEVEMENTS of the Seminar, we can congratulate ourselves on achieving a certain unanimity on aims, namely: first, French or English as the other language, with national bilingualism as the ideal to be placed over and above any local consideration; second, consideration of local needs with special attention to ethnic groups; third, the aim of taking care of the country's international requirements and commitments.

We were unanimous on the primacy of oral language instruction but were understandably unsure of the staging and the dosage.

In SUMMING UP my evaluation, I would say that the Seminar was undoubtedly an outstanding success from the point of view of the individual -- most stimulating and informative. From a professional point of view it could hardly be considered as a contribution to the field of language teaching since it included many general topics, each of which would have taken weeks to discuss.

Though we had some well-informed speakers, some of the best work was done in the discussion groups which we all felt were far too short.

Finally, because of the wide, public concern in this field -- which in the final analysis, created this Seminar -- because of the many unorganized and unexplored areas which our inquiry revealed, and because there is so much urgent work to be done in all areas of modern language teaching in this country, we are obliged to ask that another national gathering of this kind be called in the very near future. But another Seminar such as this would be useful only if we can go forward from here. Let us hope that the Seminar report will serve as a reminder that we must very soon meet together again.

19-20

SECTION B

The
Report
Chronologically

TODAY'S
DEMANDS
on
MODERN
LANGUAGE
TEACHING

by
Professor W.F. Mackey
Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Letters
Laval University

When I was asked to contribute the introduction to this important Seminar I was pleased -- and indeed honored -- to have the opportunity of addressing such a select group of persons interested in the problems of foreign language teaching. In the field of language didactics it is not very often that we get a group such as this, and I think we should make the most of this opportunity in order to describe the present-day situation in the field of language teaching, to define the problems as precisely as possible, and to try to propose ways of investigating them.

The title, "Today's Demands on Modern Language Teaching," rightly assumes that today's demands are different from those of the past. I shall therefore begin by outlining some of the differences, consider past attempts to answer the demands of the times, and conclude with a review of present-day problems in language teaching.

Today's demands on language teaching differ from those of the past in the needs, number and class of people who do the demanding, in the number and type of languages taught, in the aims and methods advanced, and in the background and training of the language teachers.

Today more people are learning languages than ever before. Of the many thousands who begin each year the study of a foreign language, however, only a tiny fraction ever succeed in mastering one. Yet a modern foreign language is now part of the curriculum of schools in nearly every country in the world. Less than a century ago this was not at all the case.

In the 17th, 18th and well into the 19th century, the mastery of a foreign language was the privilege of a ruling élite who could afford to travel and live abroad, and who also could afford a foreign governess to teach the language to their children. With the advent of universal public education, the schools began to assume the responsibility for foreign language teaching. This meant not only that more people studied a foreign language, but that they learned it less well and, in most cases, not at all. And ever since, the schools have been grappling with two questions. What is the possible level of language mastery, and how can it be attained? Does the actual level of attainment justify the inclusion of a foreign language in the curriculum?

Whether or not the level of attainment today justifies it, the public is demanding that the schools teach foreign languages to their children. The demand is created by a number of factors such as the phenomenal increase in international travel. And like everything else in the field of education, the schools are expected to supply the demand. This is perhaps part of the revolution of rising expectations which we are experiencing in so many things and in so many places.

Not only are more people studying a foreign language, but more foreign languages are being studied. A century and a half ago classical Greek and Latin were the only languages taught in most of the schools of the Western world. Then came the long struggle for the introduction of French, later came German and English, then Italian and Spanish, and after the Second World War, Russian.

In recent years, many institutions in this country have added new languages to their curriculum. In a survey of the language resources of Canada which I have been attempting to make, replies to questionnaires sent to university deans and department heads reveal that most universities have added or are adding new languages to the list of those they have usually offered. In recent years, for example, the University of British Columbia has added Oriental languages. Montreal has added a number of Slavonic and East European languages. Quebec's classical colleges have recently introduced Spanish, German and Italian into a curriculum in which English had long been the only foreign language taught. In the past few years even Eskimo has been taught at the summer schools of the Universities of Montreal and Alberta. These are just a few examples of recent changes in the language curriculum.

And the demand is far from being satisfied. This year at our university we have had requests for Czech, Swedish, Serbian and Finnish. And the growing contingents of Canadians slated for service abroad are demanding training in the languages of the areas in which they are to serve. It seems evident, therefore, that schools and colleges will continue to be faced with a growing demand for new languages.

Thirdly, languages are being studied for different reasons and taught in ways different from what they were in the past. When modern foreign languages were first introduced into the schools, their presence had to be maintained with the same arguments that justified the teaching of the ancient languages. It is not surprising if they were taught in the same way.

This was the situation in Europe until the third quarter of the 19th century when the Direct Method movement was initiated there. On this continent, however, the justification for teaching a foreign language in school remained largely academic -- and that, as a matter of policy. The influential *Report of the Committee of Twelve* of the Modern Language Association of America in the last few years of the century proclaimed "the ability to converse should not be regarded as a thing of primary importance ... but as an auxiliary to the higher ends of linguistic scholarship and literary culture." This is the policy which dominated language teaching in the United States and Canada during the first quarter of the 20th century and, in some institutions, even to the present day. This influential committee, under the chairmanship of Grandgent of Harvard, outlined what has been called the "Grammar-Translation Method." It included the teaching of grammar rules with examples and exercises in the translation of simple prose. For the Committee, the main purpose of foreign language teaching was to enable the learner to translate at sight in order eventually to be able to read the language. Great importance was also given to the proper use of the learner's mother tongue. The need for better textbooks for grammar-translation work was soon satisfied by the publication between 1900 and 1914 of texts by such well-known exponents of the method as Fraser and Squair for French, Thomas for German, Ramsey for Spanish and Grandgent himself for Italian. The stated purpose of this latter text was to prepare students to read Dante in the original.

But because of the demand for the spoken language, some Canadian teachers tried out techniques of the new "Direct" or "Reform" methods which had by now been imported from Europe. Many of them, however, became disillusioned with these methods, for they felt that what the Grammar-Translation Method neglected, the reform methods pushed to extremes. In making the mastery of the spoken language the chief objective, the nature and function of secondary schools were overlooked, for such an objective, under the normal conditions of mass instruction, was attainable only in a very limited degree. The Direct Method, for example, required not only a teacher who possessed a perfect mastery of the foreign language, but demanded of him the expenditure of much too much nervous and physical energy. It was felt, therefore, that the average pupil, not to mention the weaker one, did not justify the demands made by the oral use of the foreign language.

A vast project was therefore planned to solve the methods problem by means of experimentation. Between 1920 and 1935 there was an active period of experimentation in America. Aims were appraised, there was more planning, and even some agreement based on factual studies. The net result was the largest and most systematic study of its kind ever undertaken. Called the Modern Foreign Language Study, it began in the United States in 1923 and ended in Canada in 1927 at a joint meeting with the Canadian Committee. The results were reported in 17 volumes devoted to different aspects of language teaching -- enrolment, achievement, testing, reading, vocabulary control, bibliography, etc. One of the volumes summarized the results of the study, the essence of which is as follows:

"Since most pupils waste their time in trying to achieve the impossible in a two or three-year language course, it is better to try for something attainable, namely, a limited reading knowledge of the foreign language. This might be attained through the use of replacement texts, word counts, syntax and idiom lists -- all aimed at definite standards of achievements."

These were the conclusions which governed language teaching policy in Canada and the United States between the two world wars.

The effect of the study was to spread the Reading Method with texts based on controlled and limited vocabularies. Only a comprehension of the text was required. In practice, what was stressed was rapid, silent reading, and plenty of it. But since silent reading was a private affair and not a group activity, many teachers, for want of something to do, began to spend classroom time on other activities.

These conditions prevailed until the time the United States entered World War II and found itself incapable of supplying the language needs of its huge army and navy which were then taking up positions in all quarters of the globe. To train fluent speakers of a considerable number of languages for its far-flung operations, the American Army, with the help of the American universities, set up its own language schools under the Army Specialized Training Program, popularly known as the ASTP.

In many of these schools, language learning was a full-time job, and the results achieved after only a few months seemed so impressive as to propagate the belief that the secret to successful language teaching was to be found in the "Army Method." Actually no such method existed. All the Army had asked for was results; by which it meant a fluent speaking knowledge of the language. To achieve this end, a variety of techniques and methods was used. Advice was sought from those who had succeeded in learning some of the more exotic languages in the field. These included a number of anthropologists and linguists, who had long before pointed out that grammatical doctrine and puzzle-solving translation had been largely responsible for the failure of the schools to give even a small fraction of the population a working knowledge of a second language. What was needed was abundant contact with the spoken language, and in order to get it, there was to be a minimum of reading, writing, and grammar. Classes were kept small and met frequently for imitation and drill with a native speaker of the language operating under the direction of the instructor.

One effect of the wartime language centres was a post-war attempt by schools and colleges to imitate their work. But in the vast majority of cases this proved practically impossible since the motives could not be so urgent and the classes so small; nor could the student's full time be devoted to language learning. The great majority of secondary schools could devote only five hours a week to language teaching, and that to groups of 30 or more. The best that could be done was to double or triple the number of class hours per week, creating what came to be known as the "intensive course". Predictably, these intensive courses produced better results. But when the extra time was not available, the so-called "Army Method" did not succeed in producing anything like a fluent command of the spoken language.

The fact was that there was nothing really new in the techniques used in the military language schools. All the main features had already been mentioned half a century earlier in the Report of the Committee of Twelve, which rejected them as inapplicable, despite the fact that they had already established in Europe some time before. And since they required the services of fluent speakers of the language, of energetic language teaching specialists, these techniques were soon abandoned in the schools in favor of reading, grammar-translation exercises and all the other techniques which were handed down from the past.

These past techniques can be grouped into a dozen or so types of methods, some dating back to the 17th century. Nearly all of them are in use today. Although the old methods may be tolerated, the old objectives no longer hold. The purpose of language learning can no longer be geared to the grammatical knowledge of an examination requirement. With international travel becoming a commonplace, people are demanding a fluent speaking knowledge of the foreign language. And since it is so easy today to check one's foreign language accomplishments on the spot, substitutes for oral proficiency are becoming less and less acceptable. It is oral proficiency, therefore, that is rapidly becoming the chief aim of language teaching.

But oral proficiency takes time to achieve. And it has long been evident that it could not be achieved in a few years of secondary school language learning at a few hours a week. Attempts have therefore been made to lengthen the student's language learning career by having him start the foreign language before he enters secondary school. In order to propagate this idea, today's American exponents of it have started a movement they call FLES, meaning "Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools." A survey of foreign language in Canadian elementary schools was recently submitted as a master's thesis at the University of Alberta, and we must thank the author for making its contents available for use in this Seminar.

Although FLES may be a novelty in the United States, it is nothing new in Canada. For over half a century now public elementary schools in certain parts of Canada have been engaged in second language teaching. It has always been possible for students in the French and English communities of Quebec to test how well the schools had taught them to speak the second language; and they have seldom been entirely satisfied with the results. Consequently, there has repeatedly been pressure on school authorities in such parts of the country to begin the teaching of the second language earlier and earlier, until today, it is possible in the English schools of Quebec to start French in the first grade -- even in kindergarten. And in a few of the English elementary schools some of the school subjects are now being taught in French.

Now in all parts of the country we are hearing arguments for starting the study of a second language as early as possible -- reasons such as the child's greater facility in imitation, the flexibility of his speech centres, his ease in forming habits, his lack of self-consciousness, his later dependence on abstraction, his later adult tendency to consider the second language in terms of the first, and the growing disproportion between what he is able to do in his first language and what he wants to do in his second. The main assumptions behind these arguments are, firstly, that the chief aim is fluency in the spoken language, and secondly, that training in it will continue indefinitely.

For administrative reasons, such as the shortage of time and the lack of competent language teachers, most school systems still prefer to start the second language in secondary school. To solve the administrative problems a number of solutions have been proposed, among them, Penfield's suggestion that most of the elementary education, including that done in kindergarten, be conducted by teachers whose mother tongue is the child's second language.

In other countries of the world, the beginning age varies from five to 15. The national and social ideals of some countries prompt the early introduction of a foreign language. In some areas where the native language has no recorded literature, a foreign language is introduced early enough in primary school to permit its use as the sole medium of instruction.

Aside from the neurological and administrative arguments for and against an early start on the second language, it is quite evident that the more time one devotes to a language the more likely one is to learn it. Various attempts have therefore been made to increase the time devoted to contact with the spoken language. One such attempt has been the use of recording machines outside the classroom.

The gramophone and other such machines have long been available to language teachers; but it is only since the World War II that their use has become widespread. In 1946, Laval University began to use some surplus air-force magnetic recording equipment coupled with its inter-spaced language records. This made it possible to give the learner practice in speaking the foreign language outside of class hours by a procedure which involved listening to a call-phrase, recording a response, checking it, and imitating the correct answer. This was so effective that we began scheduling two hours of this sort of practice for every hour of class work. But I noticed that the students and teachers of French from various parts of the United States and Canada who visited our installation during summer school were more interested in the gadget itself than in the principles behind its use; for at that time, the only type of voice recording known to the public was made by grooves on various sorts of discs. Yet a few years later when magnetic wire and tape recorders began to appear on the market we got word that a few universities and colleges were using them to teach French and other languages. By analogy with the teaching laboratories in the science departments and also for credit purposes, the term "practice laboratory" became popular.

Little did we realize at the time that such installations would become standard equipment in language departments of schools and colleges. But we got an inkling of it 10 years later when the United States Department of Education, Health and Welfare sent us a report stating that there were already some 300 language laboratories in the United States, and five in Canada. That was in 1957. Only two years later, a survey of the Canadian Linguistic Association revealed that nearly every university in this country either had a language laboratory or had plans to build one. Shortly after, I was able to count 25 language laboratories in the Quebec City area alone. There is no doubt that language laboratories are here to stay. They constitute one of today's most obvious demands on modern language teaching.

The fact that a school has a language laboratory does not mean that its language teaching is better than that of a school that has none. For it's not the machines that count; it's what you put into them. This truth was driven home to me a few years ago when I was asked to make a tour of the language laboratories in the East. I must say that I was quite shocked -- not so much by the poor fidelity of the machines as by the stuff that was being fed into them. Teachers with an almost unintelligible pronunciation of the foreign language were making model tapes of material lifted out of texts intended to teach reading, writing and translation. In one case, the text was lifted right out of the dictionary. And this leads me to my fourth point -- the qualification of language teachers.

Today the demand is for teachers who have a mastery of the language they teach and who speak it with a native-like accent. This is not only because they have to make model tapes in language laboratories, but also because they are often required to teach children young enough to acquire a native-like accent by sheer imitation.

The day is coming when schools will no longer be able to regard the second language as just another subject capable of being taught by any teacher who has studied it in school. And since it is too much to ask that all teachers be fluent speakers of another language, there is a growing tendency to entrust language teaching to the specialists. In fact, this is already a policy in some provinces.

The background and training of such specialists, however, is another matter. The qualifications demanded of language specialists in some countries are much higher than they were in the past. A degree in the foreign literature is no longer sufficient. The teacher must not only be able to speak the language fluently but most also be skilled in teaching it to various age groups. He must also be able to make good use of the equipment at his disposal and may also be required to have some knowledge of applied linguistics, so as to be able to diagnose difficulties and select the appropriate remedies. This is a matter of a number of years of specialized training over and above those devoted to the acquisition of the language. By such standards, many teachers who rate as language specialists in our schools are specialists in name only.

In addition to the conditions that are generally prevalent today in most countries, there are those which are peculiar to Canada. In the choice of a second language, a Canadian school system cannot afford to ignore the official languages of the country. Most bilingual countries make the study of both official languages compulsory. The compulsory second language for children in some countries may be such languages as Flemish, Finnish, Erse, Swedish, Afrikaans, etc. Canada is one of the few bilingual countries where the minority language is also a great international language long studied throughout the world as the first foreign language. This makes the choice of French in Anglo-Canadian schools doubly important. It is not surprising if so many Canadians demand that their children be made bilingual. How many schools today can supply this demand?

Canada is not only a bilingual country; it is also one of the most important countries of immigration. It has been so for a long time; and this has had its effects on the country's ethnic character. Today, it is no exaggeration to say that if Canada is one-third British and one-third French, it is almost one-third immigrant -- that is, of neither British nor French origin. And many hundreds of thousands of these are recent arrivals, having settled in this country only after the end of the Second World War. Although they may have very little else in common, they are all faced with the problems of language learning. For if they are to work in this country and enjoy opportunities equal to those of their fellow Canadians, the first and most important thing for them to do is to become fluent in the language of the area in which they have settled. This is no easy matter -- as anyone who has been on his own in a foreign country can well imagine -- especially if he had little money and little knowledge of the language.

For several years the support of the Canadian Citizenship Branch has enabled provincial departments of education and voluntary organizations to establish language classes for immigrants in nearly all the urban centres. Most of these classes are in the evening, although they are generally taught by regular day-school teachers on a part-time basis. All these teachers have one thing in common: they are all fluent speakers of the language they are teaching. In most cases, they can speak no other. They are therefore unable to communicate with their students except in the language which they are teaching. Teaching a language under such conditions requires techniques which are even more difficult than those used in the conventional classroom. Most teachers of immigrants, however, get no special training for this sort of work. Yet there is a great need for trained teachers in immigrant language classes in this country.

This survey of today's demands on modern language teaching has been all too brief and all too general. But I must leave time for some sort of conclusion. If these are the demands, what are the problems with which we are left?

The first and most obvious is the problem of population. Not only are there more and more pupils in the schools, but they are starting language training earlier and continuing longer. It is already difficult to get enough competent teachers to supply the needs of the secondary schools without trying to furnish language teachers to primary schools as well. And one can hardly expect every primary school teacher to be fluent in two languages. To observers in other countries, however, this should not be a problem as far as Canada is concerned. For example, at a recent Unesco Seminar I was served the following remark: "Of course, you in Canada have no problem finding teachers of French; you have five million native speakers of the language." I had to explain that our self-contained provincial systems of education prevented us from exploiting this advantage, and that although we did have programs of teacher exchange, they were more active outside the country than within it. The CEA interprovincial teacher exchanges for the past year added up to the sum total of a single case.

Although any claim that we are teaching the spoken language should be admittedly backed up by a supply of teachers who have mastered it, we do know that such a mastery is not sufficient. It is simply a pre-requisite. If we were to subtract from the total number of Canadian language teachers all those whose language was not worthy to serve as a model for their students, how many language teachers would we have left? And how many would we have left if, from those remaining, we were to eliminate those who were ineffective, untrained or unskilled in imparting the language to their pupils? The professional training of the language teacher begins after the language has been mastered.

Professional training for language specialists takes more time than it did in the past, since it includes such subjects as language teaching techniques, the psychology of language learning, analytic didactics, and the like. It also includes a certain amount of what has come to be known as applied linguistics. The inclusion of linguistics in the curriculum immediately raises another problem -- whose linguistics and what sort? For there are as many schools of linguistics as there are philosophies, and some of them have very little in common. But this is not yet a problem in Canada since there is not a single centre of language teaching in the country, let alone a research institute in the field. In other countries there are such centres and institutes. They publish their learned journals in French, English, German or other languages. There is now even an International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching.

In some countries, nevertheless, the applied linguistics being taught to teachers has been regarded as sterile, out-of-date or inapplicable. This is because linguists teaching such courses are more interested in finding an application for their subject than in solving the problems of language teachers. Yet the learned aura surrounding the linguist's work coupled with the new scientific-sounding terms have often succeeded in brow-beating the teachers into silent acquiescence.

The third big problem is offered to us as a solution to the first two. Today, when faced with an overpopulation of students and an underpopulation of teachers, we immediately think of automation and mass media. But the many components of these powerful tools multiplied by the complex factors which comprise any spoken language have created problems which are not even properly understood, are poorly defined, and hence are far from being solved. In this field, the technology of our machines has far outstripped our ability to use them.

It is technically possible today to convert our language laboratories into teaching machines which can handle all the interrelated factors of the spoken language while performing all the operations involved in teaching it. But we are far from being able to exploit such a possibility. Programs now being designed for language laboratories are mostly piecemeal affairs which attempt to teach a language as a series of units rather than as the interrelated system of systems which language necessarily is. We are still a long way from the complete automation of language teaching.

The other contribution of modern technology to language teaching is in the field of mass media. This, too, raises problems which have not yet been properly defined.

For several years there have been language courses on radio and television. Although some of the best radio courses might have been better on television, many of the television courses would be no worse on radio. This is because the nature of the medium is most often ignored in the design of the course. Although there is now a great deal of language teaching being done on television, there is very little of it being done through television.

As a rule, the television teacher imagines himself teaching an immense but unseen class; and after accepting this fiction, he proceeds as if he were actually in front of his students, except that he may have to incorporate in his lesson as many props as the producer can convince him to use without disturbing the design of his course. No matter how many gimmicks are used to maintain this illusion, the fact remains that it is an illusion. And to maintain it is to use the medium of television for something it does very poorly while ignoring what it does best. Teaching through television has little in common with classroom teaching. For one thing, two-way communication is lacking; and the learning of the learner cannot guide the teaching of the teacher, as it does in class. On the other hand, television can make a language significant to an extent far beyond the power of any classroom teacher. How many TV courses are based on this dominant difference?

Even considered as models of classroom teaching, some of the language courses are very poor indeed. For the time and money spent on the teaching part of the course is only a fraction of what is spent on the broadcasting of it. That the converse should be true became very clear to me in the late 1940's when I was given a grant from one of the foundations to produce a trial language film with a view to television teaching. After six weeks of hard work, our team of five produced about 15 minutes of experimental film. It was obvious that the production of a course would have taken a great deal of time, money and personnel.

Today, many television language courses are not even edited since they are produced live and at a rate which makes it impossible to create anything worth the enormous cost of simply broadcasting the course.

In a few countries, however, it is now being realized that the production of language courses for teaching through open-circuit television is a full-time and highly-skilled job -- more complex than the production of a motion-picture film, and requiring no fewer facilities. The expense, of course, is far beyond the limits of most regional budgets. This is another difficulty raised by today's demands on modern language teaching.

Well, those are some of the problems. I don't suggest that this Seminar will solve them. I doubt that anyone here seriously thinks that it will. But if it succeeds only in understanding the problems and in defining what their solution must involve, it will have fully justified itself.

ADDITIONAL POINTS
arising out of
the discussions
following Prof.
Mackey's speech:

1. A language laboratory could possibly mean something as simple as "two tape recorders in a classroom." However, said the speaker, "you cannot build a term around quantity. It's the nature of the thing that counts."

2. At Laval University, "for every hour of language learning there are two hours of laboratory work, but one of these hours is in the drill room, because it is just as effective in so far as you are thinking of the pure, simple, repetitive element in the language." He said this type of "drill room" learning was effective en masse, but it was not possible in such circumstances for each person to progress at his own speed. Therefore, he said, it was impossible to give individual attention without wasting the time of other students.

3. The main feature of a language teaching program on television would be one that exploited the medium of television, that is, one that stressed and used the visual aspects of TV.

4. The problem of "unlearning" -- for example, a faulty accent -- is very complex. Professor Mackey was discussing this in answer to a question whether, in view of a shortage of qualified language teachers, schools should retard the beginning of a second language training. "It may be possible," he said, "with the use of automatic recording equipment and films, sound motion pictures, or

even language laboratories, to start teaching a second language earlier. On the other hand, if you have a situation where an elementary school teacher knows very little about the language, perhaps it is better not to teach it at all than to give a false notion of it."

5. Part of the training of a language teacher should be how to handle a language laboratory. He said that at Laval University, for the past three years, there have been three courses on the curriculum for language teachers, covering a three-year period: "instrumental didactics" in the first year; organization and administration of a language laboratory in the second year; and audio-visual techniques in the language laboratory in the third year. "I personally think that at least one short course is necessary for the teacher before he should be required to operate a language laboratory."

Current Programs --

MODERN

LANGUAGE

TEACHING

in the

UNITED KINGDOM

by
Arthur J. Montague, O.B.E.
British Council Liaison Officer
Ottawa

The title invites me to begin with the teachers. Almost all teachers of modern languages in U.K. schools are university graduates who have taken a degree in the language professed, plus one year of professional training. In England, the degree course is begun about a year older than in Scotland, but it takes only three years as against four in Scotland. In England normally only one language is taken to the honors stage, with another as subsidiary which is got out of the way in the middle of the course. In Scotland it is normal to take two languages, e.g. French and German, or French and Spanish. Moreover, whilst the university does not demand residence abroad, the Scottish Education Department, which certificates teachers, does, normally an academic year in one country and the balance of the 12 months in the other. This absence generally takes place half way through the course, i.e. after two years of university study, and it is spent in a foreign school or training college, as an assistant, or at a university. For some languages the residence is a term plus a summer. The Scottish university requires only four years attendance, but the arrangements for residence abroad are open for all, and not only for prospective teachers, so that an undergraduate who has not resided abroad is handicapped. In practice therefore, it is almost unknown for honors students of modern languages in Scotland not to reside for a period abroad before taking their final examination.

The English-university graduate therefore, beginning at a higher level, has a 3-years course plus one year of training; the Scottish-university graduate a five-year course plus one year of training. In both cases these graduates teach to the highest school level.

Some teaching is undertaken by graduates in their subsidiary subject, or, in Scotland, by graduates who have done two years university study of the language, plus three months residence abroad, plus a test of oral proficiency.

Language teachers hitherto have been produced only by our universities, and none by our training colleges (normal schools). An important change now taking place in education in England and Wales is the lengthening of the minimum training period in normal schools from two to three years. The change began with students entering the colleges in 1960. (In consequence no teachers qualified from training colleges this summer, a circumstance that has created its own one-year crisis). This extension of a two-year course to three has made it possible to introduce enough advanced study of French to equip teachers for at least the first years of teaching of French in schools. Previously, a training college student could qualify for such work by studying for a year, additional to his training, at the Institut Britannique in Paris. This one-year course will continue, but be reserved for serving teachers. For those in training colleges a six-month course is arranged, to be taken at Tours or Caen, as an integral part of their three years of preparation.

In addition to this training, modern language teachers in Britain commonly continue to travel and spend holidays in the country whose language they have studied: they have their seconde patrie nearby.

In the school system, modern languages are taught in secondary schools, i.e. those for pupils of about 11 years and upwards, in a few maintained primary schools (up to age 11), and also in private preparatory schools, where French is begun at age eight. Since education in Britain is, I suppose, even more decentralised than in Canada, and schools are free within very broad limits to fix their own curriculum, it is impossible to know how many pupils are studying languages, or any given language. Almost all children start a foreign language, usually French, at the beginning of their secondary school career if they are in grammar or technical schools and perhaps half of all others. They may take two or even three modern languages. The second is normally begun one year or more after the first. The basic course in a modern language is planned for five years. There will be a lesson a day, but this intensity may be increased.

In sixth forms, i.e. the top class in secondary schools, in which pupils spend two to three years, few subjects are taken and much more time devoted to each. Moreover, a new modern language may be started in the sixth form and it may be carried on to the honors stage at a university.

The external examinations which secondary school pupils take are at the Ordinary level, about age 16, after five years of secondary study, and the Advanced level, about two years later. These examinations at both levels include an oral test (conducted in the foreign language) and a dictation. The written papers include unseen translation into and from the foreign language, free composition, and at the Advanced level a literary paper that requires detailed knowledge of some texts and assumes background reading of others. One of the examining bodies, of which there are nine, requires in addition the reading of eight to 10 texts from a list of some 40 texts or authors, and this reading is examined, in English, after the oral test in the foreign language. Another of the examining bodies proposes to eliminate translation into the foreign language from its Ordinary level examination. Instead it will substitute tests requiring ability to read fairly long passages in the foreign language quickly and with understanding, and it will give a more exacting oral examination.

The numbers of candidates taking examinations in the various languages may be of interest. Moreover, the more compact Scottish system of education does yield some general figures which may be a rough guide to the United Kingdom as a whole.

To take these figures first, here is (i) total number of secondary school pupils in Scotland studying each language, (ii) number taking each language in the Scottish Leaving Certificate Examination, Lower Grade, (iii) number taking this examination at the Higher Grade. The figures are for 1961.

	(i)	(ii)	(iii)
French	120,357	6,315	4,813
German	10,491	1,259	830
Spanish	1,258	127	117
Russian	486	80	31
Italian		25	37

About 10 times as many children study French as all other modern languages combined. At the examination stage this proportion is reduced by more than half (4.2 at Lower Grade, 4.8 at Higher).

Figures for the English and Welsh General Certificate of Education, 1961 examinations, are:

	Ordinary Level	Advanced Level
French	136,673	16,230
German	22,855	4,713
Spanish	6,740	1,412
Italian	651	326
Russian	761	230
Modern languages not separately classified	212	50

The Scottish figures show just over four times as many candidates taking French as all other modern languages at the Lower examination level (4.2), and the English figures for Ordinary level are the same (4.4). On the other hand, the Scottish figure for the Higher level, 4.8, compares with 2.4 at Advanced level in England. This, I think, is because the Advanced level is higher than the Scottish Higher standard, and there seems to be a tendency for French to lose its overwhelming supremacy at the higher levels of study. The latest university returns (University Grants Committee Returns from Universities and University Colleges 1959-60) show that the number of candidates graduating with honors in French, or French plus another language, is just less than double the number graduating with honors in all the other main modern languages studied (849 and 427).

It is still an enormous and significant majority. When French is put to the vote in Britain, we give it a massive oui.

What methods of teaching are used? In the first place, language teachers in Britain, like those in any other country, when they get together for meetings such as this one, would undoubtedly agree that (in the words of the report of the Council of Europe Seminar on the Teaching of Modern Languages, March, 1962) "the introduction to all modern languages should be oral for pupils and students of all ages". Moreover, the linguistic training of our modern language teachers should give, and I think does give, a sound oral knowledge. It is no longer considered un-British to try to speak a foreign language well. A headmaster of a famous English school, hearing of the success of a former pupil as a French scholar, fully accepted in France and lecturing at the Sorbonne, remarked "I am not surprised. As a boy he was always affected." But that is an old story, referring to a bad past now largely forgotten.

One important element in achieving the present good oral knowledge of foreign languages among teachers must be mentioned. It is the Assistant Scheme, which has been operating between France and Britain for over 40 years and with Austria, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Spain and Switzerland for shorter periods. The conditions vary slightly from country to country. The conditions in France and Britain are that prospective French teachers of English and U.K. teachers of French are received as Assistants in the other country for a year. They give a limited number of hours of conversation in their own language, outside of the hours of formal instruction, and otherwise devote themselves to study, for which they are given every facility by the principal of the school or training college to which they are attached. In France they may also be attached to a university and sometimes they spend two years and take a licenciée-ès-lettres. The numbers involved are impressive. My latest figure, which is for a year or two ago, shows that 600 went from Britain to France in one year.

Despite the good level of oral competence among teachers, the oral approach, though universally praised, is not universally practised. The impediments are the well-known ones: too large classes, the influence of written examinations, and the expense of equipment.

Certainly radio lessons, of the highest quality, have been an aid to teachers of French and German for over 30 years, and it is thought they will be more useful than ever now that they may be taped -- legally. Both Independent Television and B.B.C. Television have now programs in French, and the B.B.C. in German, though these will be taken by few schools. A few language laboratories equipped with twin-track tape-recorders have been installed and many more are planned. A number of schools use the Tavor audio-visual course produced in the United States, and others use the *Voix et Images* course produced at Saint-Cloud. We ourselves are producing audio-visual courses for adult beginners in German and Spanish.

In passing, a word may be said to praise the remarkable work done in this field by the French, who in the past rivalled the English for the distinction of being the worst speakers of languages in Europe.

English as a Foreign Language

It is clear, therefore, that British teachers of modern languages recognise the value of much of this equipment, but they do not dispose of it in great abundance. It is satisfactory to notice that when it comes in it is first used in the training colleges and university departments of education. We have all seen expensive equipment unused because staff were unfamiliar with it.

The problem of large classes, especially in the first year or two of secondary school, is a serious one in Britain, and no substantial improvement can be forecast for the near future.

The influence of examinations on curriculum and methods is not confined to Britain. Essentially the difficulty is that oral examinations are expensive, whilst written examinations are relatively cheap and easy to organise. It will have been noticed, however, that there is an oral section of school examinations in Britain and that examining boards give evidence of at least having heard of complaints of the excessive importance given to translation in examinations.

I must not give the impression, however, that the teaching of modern languages is in a poor or backward state in Britain. On the whole, modern languages may be the best taught of all subjects in our secondary schools. The teachers are as well equipped as any; *realien* are easily come by; the "assistants" are near to the pupils' age and are popular with them and with staff; pupil travel abroad is encouraged (several thousand senior pupils take holiday courses on the continent each year); *au pair* arrangements are easily made and are satisfactory. Small wonder that one so often hears singing from the modern language classroom.

Current Programs --

MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING in the UNITED STATES

by
Dr. Joseph C. Hutchinson
Department of Foreign Languages
U.S. Office of Education
Washington

I am wearing two hats today. I am officially representing the National Education Association which has a new Department of Foreign Languages, organized only a year ago, and of which I am the Interim Secretary. However, my full-time position is with the U.S. Office of Education, working with the language program of the National Defence Education Act.

I just want to point out that this new development in a professional activity, or as an extra-curricular activity with the NEA, is indicative of the rapidly-growing situation in foreign languages in the United States. Many of us felt that to reach the teachers in the elementary and secondary schools, and those who are already associated with the NEA, it would be very useful to organize a department within the NEA. This is an unprecedented move, and was thought out many years ago. In fact, many teachers and leaders in the profession had been trying to work this out for the past 30 years, so we are delighted to have achieved it.

At the same time, we do not try to compete with the existing professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association of America, but are trying to cooperate with them, and to reach teachers, and offer services where the existing organizations have not been able to operate. However, we have no permanent staff at the NEA, so many of us are working extra hours to try to keep up with this particular activity.

In the United States we have many, in fact, almost the same, problems as the foreign language teachers in Canada and I am sure in many other countries throughout the world, because these are universal problems that we are discussing. The past decade has been a period of unprecedented re-examination in the role of modern foreign language study in American schools and higher education, heralding an advanced program of change and self-improvement. I can only hope to give you a few of the highlights, although, I am sure, that much of what I say will be familiar to many of you who have followed the situation in the United States. For example, Professor Mackey's appraisal was most accurate of the situation in the United States.

In 1952, the Modern Language Association of America, a learned society for teachers of English and foreign languages with membership almost entirely from colleges and universities, initiated its foreign language program which investigated the national situation in relation to foreign language education. Many of the findings of this program are summarized in Professor William Parker's book, "The National Interest in Foreign Languages". This is a third edition which includes many of the early reports on the National Defence Education Act. This evidence showed an astonishing disparity between (i) the new and growing responsibilities of the American people in world affairs and (2) the unpreparedness of American education to provide adequate instruction in the skills of even the most commonly-taught modern foreign languages. It seemed obvious that only a major developmental effort could change the situation and that M.L.A.'s foreign language program offered a set of policies for such an effort.

Also in 1952, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath, publicly admitted a change in his own attitude towards foreign language education. He urged the profession and laymen to unite their energies in an effort to increase the study of foreign languages. This was an unprecedented move.

In case you are not familiar with some of the attitudes existing in the United States about foreign language study, there is a revealing story of an oral conversation between a foreign language teacher and the superintendent of schools in one of our states. The superintendent's attitude was as follows: "I think that education's main purpose is to teach right from wrong. I do not see any place for foreign languages in this study. Besides, if the English language is good enough for Jesus Christ, it's good enough for me."

The efforts of the profession, through the Modern Language Association and the Office of Education, led, as many of you know, to the passage of the National Defence Education Act in 1958 which was aimed primarily at correcting "the existing imbalances in our educational programs which had led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages". Although the U.S. Office of Education administers the aid provided through this Act, it has no power to establish and supervise national educational standards. Rather, it cooperates with state, local and private educational agencies in shaping goals and policies. Modern foreign languages are supported through three major programs of the Act. The main one, called The Language Development Program, first of all contracts with universities for the training of elementary and secondary school modern foreign language teachers. This is 100 percent supported. Last summer over 80 institutes were given by universities and colleges and since the program has been under way over 10,000 teachers have received institute training. However, we realize that there are approximately 30,000 to 35,000 secondary school foreign language teachers so there is much more to be done. In fact, in many cases the institute program is not enough, not sufficient for the teachers who have already had in-service training.

Other programs of the branch are the contracts for a great variety of research and experimentation in the teaching of modern foreign languages and the introduction of immediate instruction and materials particularly in the so-called neglected languages in the areas of Asia, Africa and the Soviet Union. The branch also provides fellowships for advanced training in neglected languages. In addition, it supports language centres in universities for advanced training, primarily in neglected languages.

The program with which I am associated provides matching funds to public schools and loans to provide schools for the purchase of instructional equipment and material for strengthening foreign language instruction. These programs are administered by each state educational agency. I might add that the development in each state is quite different from the next. As part of this program, of course, the installation of language laboratories and allied equipment has seen a tremendous rise. We estimate that there are at least over 5,000 secondary schools in the United States now which are equipped with some kind of language laboratory as compared to about 64 in 1958.

However, apart from the large money part of the program, there is a smaller part that is often overlooked in the press, and this is the one that is much more important. It is the part of the program which provides matching funds to the state educational agencies for the employment of foreign language supervisors within the state education department, to provide consultative services and professional leadership to teachers and administrators. It includes a variety of activities, particularly in in-service training programs, compared to such programs at the local level. Before NEA, in 1958, there were only three states which had foreign language specialists on their staffs. As of today, there are at least 38 states with a total of 56 specialists in foreign languages on their staffs.

Foreign language teaching has also received a great fillip from research and experimentation in educational media. Many of these projects have been directly related to foreign language instruction. Of course, in the past four years, while about $50,000,000 in federal funds had been spent for strengthening modern foreign language instruction, private foundations have added considerable sums in addition to that because much of the money in this program requires action funds. Changes which normally take place within a generation are growing rapidly within a few years. However, the situation is still in a transitional state for most of the country, and much more needs to be done before the profession can relax or return to a normal tempo.

Some of the major developments in the schools have been the following:

1. A greater availability of language study and greater student interest, together with increased support by the public and by professional educators.

2. A trend toward longer sequences of foreign language study, with increasing emphasis upon an earlier beginning, especially in the elementary school.

3. A strong movement to teach listening comprehension and speaking ability as well as reading and writing.

4. A rapid spread of the study of the Russian language and the beginnings of courses in other languages such as Chinese and Arabic. For example, in 1957, only six day schools taught Russian. Now, there are well over 550 in the United States.

Here is a summary of a few of the findings of the Modern Language Association which has been studying the situation. I'll give you a quick run-down on the public secondary school enrolment situation. We'll first compare it with the federal population in high school. The total high school population enrolled in modern foreign languages way back in 1915 was 35 percent of the total high school population. But there was a tremendous drop much later, and in 1949 it was as low as 13 percent of the high school population. Then it began a gradual rise: in 1954, up one percent to 14; in 1958, up two more to 16 percent; in 1959, three more to 19 percent; in 1960, (our latest figures), up to 21 percent of the total high school population. Between the years 1958 and 1959 the total high school population increased 3.3 percent whereas modern foreign language enrolment increased 19.9 percent or six times the increasing population of the high schools.

Equally striking and encouraging is the increase in the number of schools offering instruction in modern foreign languages. In 1954, only 43 percent of the secondary schools offered such courses. In 1958, we reach 50 percent, and in 1959, 60 percent of the schools were offering such instruction. To give you an example in one state, Indianna, the high school enrolment in modern foreign languages in 1959 totalled 18,000. In 1960, it was 28,000 and in 1961, 38,000 -- a rise of 10,000 each year in the past three years. At the same time, Latin is also gaining. You should remember that modern foreign languages is not a required course in American public secondary schools. Enrolment is dependent on student interest and available offerings. Spanish is the most popular, followed by French. In fact French has recently replaced Latin as the second most popular of all foreign languages. German ties Russian as next in the order.

In the past, most programs were only for two years although some schools in large cities offered three years and only a handful, four. Today, many school systems have begun instruction in Grade seven, making possible a six-year sequence through Grade 12.

Even more dramatic has been the phenomenal increase of various types of language programs in the elementary school which we call "FLES". This movement has been increasing gradually during the past 10 years so that there is now no way of knowing exactly how many such programs exist. In 1959, there were over 8,000 elementary schools involved and over one and a quarter million pupils in this kind of program. Practices vary greatly from the use of a specialist teacher all the way to the regular classroom teacher who may or may not have any idea as to how the language is really spoken. The latter situation has led to a number of serious experiments with television teaching by a master language teacher. Whatever the methods, some of the FLES programs are remarkably effective, while many others result in practically no language learning.

The most fundamental change that has taken place in the schools is in the method of logical approach. In the past, with few exceptions, foreign language instruction was dedicated to the teaching of reading through the study of grammar and vocabulary. The basic approach, with only minor variations, was extensive translation. Teacher training, instructional materials and the standard curriculum were directed to this objective. Today there is general acceptance of an approach to language mastery as a full-part progression. Listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and finally, writing.

Language is to be understood as fully functional in all four skills. In the early stages of learning, where the emphasis is placed on listening comprehension and speaking, it is sometimes called the audio-lingual approach. This shift of emphasis is parallel, led by recent advances in linguistic science and allied fields which have contributed to a new view of language and language learning. This view is best characterized as a view of language as spoken communication, as a system of habits or behaviour which must be acquired to the point of automatic production of and response to the structures of the language, and acceptable to a native speaker. Grammar or structure is thus, by no means discarded, as is sometimes supposed, but the emphasis is on internalizing it. Large segments of the language profession, the education profession, and the general public, support this approach as being sound and appropriate to the oral communication needs of the modern world. Longer course sequences in the secondary schools encourage this approach and the language curriculum which starts in the elementary school can hardly do otherwise if it is to succeed.

But a change to the current functional methods cannot be accomplished quickly unless progress has been made. Teacher training, summer institutes, NEA and other in-service efforts are very much geared to providing the right opportunities for teachers to improve their knowledge and skills in the areas of the spoken language and in learning new classroom techniques and in using more efficiently new instruction materials and equipment.

The implementation of functional language teaching has caused an upset in the publishing industry which must now supply new instructional materials which are quite different from the traditional concept of a textbook, that is, grammar and the reading selections. The typical new package includes a student's book, a teacher's edition with detailed discussion of methodology and complete lesson plans for each unit, a complete set of tapes for a classroom and/or for a language laboratory use, small phonograph records for home practice, workbooks, tests, range charts, and the like.

The new literature on the teaching of foreign languages is enormous and real strides are being made. There is also a new series of films which demonstrate many details of the newer methods and techniques of teaching.

In spite of all this effort, there is a tremendous shortage of qualified foreign language teachers. It is not at all certain that American colleges and universities are training teachers now so that they will not need subsequent training of the type given in the NEA institutes. It seems apparent that a revision of teacher training curriculum is very much in order. This is probably the most serious problem that the modern language profession faces today.

The experience of the past few years has demonstrated the fundamental flexibility and vitality of education in a free society. Never before have working relationships among various levels and types of professional educators been better than in the foreign language field. Professional associations, educational agencies at local and state levels, individual teachers and the general public have joined to employ the resources of the federal government in a voluntary mobilization designed to raise the national level of foreign language competency. At stake is the effective role of the American people in world affairs at a critical time in history. A substantial start has been made.

Current Programs --

MODERN
LANGUAGE
TEACHING
in the
SOVIET UNION

by
John E.R. Lloyd
Lecturer
Carleton University
Ottawa

I was fortunate to be one of those selected by the British Council to take part in the exchange of post-graduate students between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union in the 1960-61 academic year. Students are not normally exchanged, nor are teachers. This does not, of course, apply to non-aligned and insufficiently-developed countries. I spent 10 months at Leningrad University from September 1960 to July 1961.

One should first of all stress the tremendous enthusiasm with which many Soviet school children and students and other citizens too, approach the task of learning foreign languages. English has now supplanted German as the first foreign language taught in most schools and institutes of higher education. French would be third on the list now, followed by Spanish, Italian and Chinese. (Chinese is taught more widely than one might expect.)

English-language broadcasts by American stations and even more so perhaps by the BBC, are avidly listened to by thousands of Russians; the Voice of America and other American stations perhaps mainly for the jazz and other entertainment, and BBC for its news broadcasts and talks. Seldom is an opportunity missed to practice English, German, French or whatever it may be, with visiting tourists and delegations. This great desire to learn English and other foreign languages may be attributed in part to a psychological safety-valve or necessity. One of the most frequently heard complaints against the government is that it is so difficult for most people to travel abroad. Hence many Russians who have met Westerners envy their ease in being able to travel abroad.

The Soviets in the 14 non-Russian constituent republics and in other non-Russian areas of the U.S.S.R. have to spend considerable time in attempting to master two languages, the language of the Republic or district, and Russian. At Leningrad University I knew students from Central Asia, for example, who all had to have a year or so tuition in Russian when they arrived in order to study in Leningrad. Perhaps this profusion and experience of languages in the Soviet Union helps to explain the high standard and purposefulness of language teaching in the U.S.S.R., for I must say I was on the whole impressed by what I saw.

Children normally start school when seven or eight years old. Russians are often genuinely horrified that children sometimes start earlier in Western countries. A foreign language is not usually taught until the fifth class so that the child would then normally be about 12 or 13 years old. The pupil would continue to study the language until he leaves school, that is, from the fifth to eighth class in an eight-year school and from the fifth to eleventh class in an 11-year school. Records, tapes, films and other oral and visual aids of a similar nature would not, as yet, normally be used on a large scale in Soviet schools for modern language teaching.

Unless the school were a special language school, which I shall deal with later, in all institutes and universities each student must study a foreign language, whether or not he is specializing or majoring in foreign languages -- that is, as at a Canadian university as far as I know, but unlike the United Kingdom.

For the non-specialist in modern languages at technical colleges, at least two or three years' language study would be compulsory. Sometimes nowadays in all five years at a technical college the study of a foreign language is required. Lessons would normally be held two or three times a week. Students thus equipped would be able to work with literature of their speciality. I stress the words "of their speciality." Language instruction at university would be on a broader basis with less of a technical bias.

Students majoring in a foreign language at a university or teachers' training college with a view to becoming teachers, interpreters, translators and so on, would have classes at least six times a week, which would entail 20 to 24 hours a week. From the third year onwards classes would normally be held about five times a week, that is, 17 or 18 hours a week. A second foreign language is compulsory for a student majoring in foreign languages. Extensive use would be made of filmstrips, records and tapes, etc., unlike the schools. Foreign films in the particular language would be visited, plays read and staged. There would certainly, in addition, be courses in the literature and history of the particular country, linguistics, the origin of languages, the history of the U.S.S.R., general history, political economy and Marxism and Leninism. I can tell you that not a few students gripe at having to spend valuable time studying the latter two, political economy and Marxism and Leninism. So, the historical aspect of the language is much stressed.

As one who took Russian language courses for foreigners at Leningrad University, I can vouch for the fact that great attention is attached to phonetics, and the use of tapes and records, though the facilities in the language laboratories are sometimes rather primitive.

In Leningrad in 1961 there were four English schools. Two of them were opened in 1960. There was also one German school and one French school in Leningrad in 1961. There was a boarding school in or near Leningrad where Chinese was taught. I never found it, but it was there. In 1961 there were 54 boarding schools in and near Leningrad, most of them having been founded in the last few years. The waiting list for the language schools in Leningrad is tremendous and parents are very keen to get their children enrolled. Language schools, especially English schools, have sprung up all over the Soviet Union.

I shall now talk a little bit about an English school which I visited there. I visited the number one English school, founded in a suburb of Leningrad four years ago. There are about 800 pupils at the school, so many, in fact, that the school has to be divided into two shifts, morning and afternoon, a not unusual occurence at Soviet schools. The pupils study 11 years in school. All the staff, nearly all women, incidentally, as is usual with teachers in the Soviet Union, continually spoke good, correct, careful English to us.

The first class visited was one for eight-year-olds. The pupils had been doing English for about six months. The friendliness, discipline, good behaviour and charm of the children was, as is usual with Soviet children, quite outstanding. They had done about six months' English and were doing phonetic exercises with mirrors, consisting of one, two, three, four movements with mouth, lips and tongue, a bit like the British army, one, two, three, four. Very little Russian was being used by the teacher. Pupils were asked to do something by the teacher and to describe what they were doing. Lines were recited and a song called "Bright Stars" was sung. Toys were held up by the teacher and described by the pupils. A refreshing feature was the absence of a portrait or bust of Lenin in the room, a rare occurence elsewhere but perhaps not in classrooms of very young children. The pupils were being taught, as is now general in the U.S.S.R., "English English," but were constantly using the North American cliché, "You're welcome." Standard performance of these eight-year-olds was very high. It should be pointed out that not all classes in this English school were taught in English, in fact, only English is taught in English. There would be eight hours' Russian a week. In the elementary grades there would be four hours a week, only, of conversation, grammar and phonetics. In the middle grades there would be six lessons a week, and in the senior grades, seven lessons a week. Among methods used would be tape recordings of British visitors, perhaps North American visitors too, and tape recordings of the pupils themselves, and the radio for telling or retelling the story. A new word being introduced would not normally be translated. I noticed a board on which objects would be moved around. Questions would be asked and new words used and practiced. There would be the drama society which would put on the Soviet's favorite English authors, Shakespeare, Shaw and Wilde, for example. Senior pupils would do the acting and the text would be explained beforehand.

Emphasis is mainly on the spoken language in these English schools and oral topics would be selected. For example, "London," "Leningrad," "theatre," "English films" and so on, would be topics used to improve their vocabulary in conversation. Incidentally, six films each year are normally exchanged between the Soviet Union and Western countries. Foreign films are usually tremendously well attended and very popular.

In oral work, adapted texts, which are bound, are often used and books are analyzed and criticised. Though the emphasis tends to be on the spoken language, compositions, reports and dictations, etc., are done too. I recall a literature lesson of the eighth class at this English school which would be mainly of 15-year-olds. They talked about Hamlet, Othello, Romeo and Juliet. I recall Romeo and Juliet being described as the victims of class prejudice.

Besides authors already mentioned, pupils expressed an interest in, and not inconsiderable knowledge of, Hemmingway, Galsworthy and Cronin.

Extra-curricular activities would be largely the same as at any other Soviet school. For English, say, the drama society visits English and American films and tries to sing the songs in English.

As in other schools, all the pupils would have to work one day in a plant or factory and the pupils would all have a special dress similar to Czarist Russia.

When I visited an English class at one of the innumerable boarding schools which have sprung up around Leningrad and elsewhere, I noticed the emphasis on oral work and the use of many visual aids and that the class was conducted in English. The children's handwriting was, as usual, excellent.

As I have said before, the staff in English school number one spoke particularly good, almost faultless, English. None of them was English and the same may be said about the boarding school. However, the same mistakes tend to be made by Soviet teachers in English, for example, "cloths" for clothes and "jorney" for journey, "raise your arm," "the sun shines," (not, is shining) and many other slight mistakes like that. But there can be no denying the conscientiousness and enthusiasm of Soviet language teachers. A very large part of the national income goes toward education in the Soviet Union. I believe about 20 percent, rather more than in many Western countries. Large numbers of Moscow, but not foreign, editions of foreign writers, with many omissions however, would appear almost weekly. Adapted texts also appear in very considerable quantities. Dictionaries and textbooks, particularly for English, are published in very large quantities and new ones are constantly appearing. They are being subsidized, of course, by the government and are consequently very cheap indeed. Small wonder that foreign languages, and English in particular, play such a prominent part in the Soviet Union educational program.

QUESTIONS -- and ANSWERS by Mr. Lloyd and Dr. Hutchinson

Q: Do they use an oral approach in Russia?

Mr. Lloyd: You must realize that while the Soviet Union is a very large country, I saw schools mainly in the Leningrad area. But from what I observed, I know that very great attention is paid to conversation and the oral approach -- and that is right from the beginning. Reading and writing are introduced later. This means that the children start talking from the word "go" and as far as possible the lesson is held in English.

Q: Who selects the Institutes which receive aid in the United States:

Dr. Hutchinson: Those universities which are interested in obtaining a contract for an Institute submit a proposal to the Office of Education. A committee of outside consultants or professionals then makes recommendations to the Commissioner for Education, who makes the selection.

Q: How are teachers selected to attend the Institutes?

Dr. Hutchinson: We have certain basic criteria, but each Institute director ultimately has the final choice. There are many more applicants, thousands and thousands more than can be accommodated at the Institutes and so it is a problem of trying to get the most useful teachers who will get the most out of attendance at them. The state supervisors are very useful in advising the Institute directors within their state as to which teachers are perhaps the best potential leaders and can do the most good with this training.

Q: How long does it take a Russian student to acquire the ability to discuss heavy literature?

Mr. Lloyd: The particular class I spoke about was composed of mainly 15-year-olds. They were practising English in the English school and the standard of English in these schools would be higher than in the vast mass of Russian or Soviet schools. English schools have sprung up all over the country. There are four in Leningrad alone.

Q: How many language laboratories are there in the United States and how much do they cost?

Dr. Hutchinson: Our estimate is that there are over 5,000 high schools currently equipped with language labs of some kind. We have attempted a national survey but it is too difficult a problem to follow. Currently, we have furnished a questionnaire to each state asking the people there if they would be willing to cooperate in surveying their own state. We will find out more in the next few months.

As for money being spent on modern language equipment, I don't have the figures with me but a total of about sixty to seventy million dollars a year in federal aid is earmarked under our program for science, mathematics and languages. Now each state makes its own priority as to which of these three fields gets which amount of money. The general average each year for the past four years for modern languages has been about 17 percent. Some states use as much as 30 percent of their funds for languages and some as low as five percent. This money is not just for language labs but it also goes for many other things such as instructional materials, printed materials, reference books, tapes, films, projectors and so on.

Q: Do teachers attending the Institutes write examinations?

Dr. Hutchinson: As you may know, the Modern Language Association has developed a series of tests for qualifications of teachers. These have been given in the Institutes and are available now for use anywhere. Pennsylvania is the first state to require this as part of a teacher's certificate. I think New Hampshire is beginning to use them, so we are beginning to get a few states which are sticking their necks out, so to speak, in using this new battery of tests.

Q: Where can you obtain information about U.S. programs?

Dr. Hutchinson: From the U.S. Office of Education, Publications Inquiry Unit, Washington, 25. Single copies of our publications are usually free on request.

Current Programs --
MODERN
LANGUAGE
TEACHING
in
BELGIUM

by
Etienne Harford
Conseiller
Ambassade de Belgique au Canada

The Problem

Belgium, like Canada, is a country of two languages and cultures. The Netherlandish is spoken by a majority of Belgians (nearly 60 percent) but French, the language of the minority, is an international language which is not the case for Netherlandish. From these considerations, one can already infer two consequences: firstly, it is indispensable for a group of people, at executive level, to be fully bilingual, and, secondly, the necessity for the Flemish to speak French is somewhat more acute than the necessity for the Walloons to speak Netherlandish.

Finally, Belgium being a small country situated in the heart of Europe, and Brussels being for all practical purposes the capital of Europe, it is imperative for a large number of the population to have a good knowledge of the languages spoken by her neighbours, expecially English and German.

Historical Background

To fully understand the present set-up, it is necessary to recall some historical facts. French, spoken for centuries by the Walloon section of the country, has always been spoken by the elite in Flanders. When the northern provinces of the Low Countries were separated from the southern ones to become the independent kingdom of the Netherlands, in the southern provinces, still being subjected to foreign occupation, the Netherlandish became a static and somewhat archaic language. The position and prestige of what was then called the Flemish language further deteriorated in 1830, when Belgium became an independent country. The Revolution had been waged against Holland and there was a sharp reaction against the Netherlandish language and culture. In spite of the fact that the Constitution fully guaranteed the freedom of the two languages, French became for all practical purposes the official language of the country. In the latter part of the 19th century was created the "Flemish movement" whose aim was to revive Netherlandish language and culture, with the ultimate purpose of aligning completely Flemish with the Dutch language -- which is now practically realized. It should be noted that the Flemish movement was of social character. It was directed against the Flemish elite, which could no longer understand the language of the people. The movement towards a renaissance of the Netherlandish language was further accelerated after the war, especially when universal suffrage was granted to all Belgians. I should remind you that at the time Flemish was only taught in primary schools. There were no Flemish high schools or universities.

Present Situation

In 1932, the Belgian Parliament decided in favor of unilinguism, i.e. in the Flemish part of the country education at all levels would be totally conducted in the Netherlandish while education would be conducted exclusively in French in the Walloon provinces. A special regime was enforced for the region surrounding Brussels, where the choice was left to the parents to decide whether their children would be educated in the Netherlandish or in the French language. The same regime, which was later on slightly amended, is still in force to-day.

The Teaching of the Second National Language and of Foreign Languages

Elementary schools.-- In theory, the teaching of the second national language is not compulsory in either region. However, if a small group of parents requires it, the teaching of the second national language, (i.e. French in the Flemish schools or Netherlandish in the Walloon schools) can be organized on the basis of three hours a week. It appears that the great majority of Flemish parents take advantage of these facilities and the Walloon parents in a somewhat smaller proportion. Apart from the two national languages no other language can be taught in an elementary school.

In the region around Brussels, the teaching of the second national language is compulsory. The curriculum should include three hours per week of such teaching in the second year of elementary school. It is increased to five hours a week in the third and fourth years.

Secondary schools -- Although the teaching of the second language is not compulsory in the secondary schools, i.e. classical colleges and teachers' colleges -- with the exception of those schools situated in a Brussels region -- in the Flemish schools practically 100 percent of the students take up French as a second language. In the Walloon schools, the proportion is not so high, and 88 percent only of the students select Netherlandish as the second language, while eight percent select English and four percent German.

As regards the third language, nearly 100 percent of the students in the Flemish schools are taking up English while in the Walloon schools the proportion in favor of English is somewhat smaller since 11 percent choose Netherlandish as a third language. Regarding the fourth language, practically 100 percent of the students in the Flemish schools select German. Here, again, the proportion of students selecting German in the Walloon schools is somewhat inferior, about 10 percent choosing either Netherlandish or English.

Universities -- In the universities, foreign languages are studied in the specialized faculties: philology or commercial and economic schools.

Assessment of Teaching Methods

The teaching of the second national language has for many years been under severe criticism. This teaching has been described as too theoretical or literary. Under the influence of parents' associations, the teaching of the second language has in recent years taken a more practical turn. Strangely enough, it appears that foreign languages have always been taught in a more practical way.

It should be noted that the teachers of languages in elementary schools do not require any more qualification than the certificate granted by the Teachers' College, while the masters of language in classical colleges have to be university graduates.

Conclusion

In Belgium there is a growing awareness of the necessity for a substantial number of persons to be fully bilingual. These qualifications are now required for all executive posts in the central administration. Moreover, in the European process of unification, it has become indispensable for executives in industrial or commercial concerns to have a good knowledge of either English or German and very often of both.

L'ENSEIGNEMENT

des

LANGUES ÉTRANGÈRES

en FRANCE

par
Francois Weymuller
Conseiller culturel
Ambassade de France au Canada

I learned English in my own Provincial city many, many years ago. There were no visual aids, no records, no tapes, no language lab, and yet, when I came to the Sorbonne, I discovered that I could talk with an English or an American student without too much difficulty. Still, I never taught English in my life, nor any other foreign language, therefore I was surprised when your representative asked me to discuss the teaching of modern languages in France for you in English. I thought that I would give you wrong ideas on this subject if I offered such a living example of bad English. Indeed my English is no longer what it was in school. Travelling abroad, and learning several other foreign languages have not improved it. J'ai donc décidé de vous adresser la parole en français. Après tout, vous avez donné à cette réunion un certain caractère international en invitant si aimablement des représentants de plusieurs ambassades étrangères, et le français est toujours à sa place dans un réunion internationale, particulièrement quand elle se tient au Canada, et que son objet est l'enseignement des langues modernes.

Je n'étudierai que l'enseignement des langues étrangères aux Français, je laisserai de côté l'enseignement du français aux étrangers en France. Il a fait récemment des progrès révolutionnaires, mais il y aurait trop à dire sur ce sujet, et mes compatriotes les Professeurs Vinay et Rigault vous en parleront sans doute demain.

Pendant longtemps, vous le savez, les Français se sont peu souciés d'apprendre les langues étrangères. Ils n'en avaient guère besoin lorsqu'ils ne quittaient pas l'Europe. Aux XVIIème et au XVIIIème siècle, leur langue était celle de toutes les élites cultivées. Au temps où les bêtes parlaient, les bêtes elles-mêmes parlaient français, comme vous savez, au moins dans nos contes de fées. Les Français se contentaient donc, quand ils faisaient des études, d'apprendre le latin, et assez souvent le grec. A la veille de la Révolution de 1789, un écrivain, Rivarol, écrivait: "Ce qui n'est pas clair n'est pas français." De là à penser que tout ce qui n'est pas français n'est pas clair, il n'y avait qu'un pas, et des millions de Français le franchissaient allègrement. A quoi bon se brouiller les idées en apprenant la langue des autres? Mais c'est précisément avec la Révolution que les choses commencèrent à changer. Les Français faisaient maintenant appel à tous les peuples de l'Europe, et ils se rendirent compte assez vite qu'il fallait parler aux peuples dans leurs propres langues et non plus seulement en français. Quand on prêche la Liberté, l'Egalité et la Fraternité, on doit essayer de comprendre son frère, même s'il a le malheur de ne pas savoir la langue qui mériterait d'être universelle, c'est-à-dire le français. Ainsi, lorsqu'elle créa en 1794 les premières écoles centrales, qui remplaçaient les collèges de l'Ancien Régime et annonçaient déjà les lycées de Napoléon Bonaparte, le Convention y introduisit l'enseignement des langues étrangères. Mais il était alors facultatif. Il l'était encore sous Charles X. L'Ordonnance du 26 Mars 1829 prévoyait deux heures de langues étrangères par semaine pendant les quatre premières années du Lycée, c'est-à-dire de l'école secondaire. Mais cet enseignement était destiné aux seuls volontaires. C'est en 1840 que l'enseignement d'une langue étrangère devint obligatoire dans les lycées français. Pendant la première année, on devait apprendre la grammaire et un peu de vocabulaire; la 2ème année, on commençait a faire des traductions, versions et thèmes, et c'est seulement en 3ème année que le professeur était invité à faire de temps en temps un cours en langue étrangère, que les élèves devaient ensuite résumer dans cette langue. Mais les instructions données aux professeurs étaient encore très vagues. Le sentiment général était peu favorable à l'enseignement des langues étrangères. Les directeurs des lycées opposaient une résistance déterminée à son développement: par exemple, ils plaçaient les cours de langue à des heures peu commodes et beaucoup d'élèves n'y venaient pas.

C'est seulement depuis une centaine d'années que cet enseignement s'est implanté solidement dans nos écoles, que ses méthodes et ses programmes se sont peu à peu précisés et perfectionnés, et que son personnel s'est formé et spécialisé, grâce aux instructions ministérielles de 1863, à l'effort de rénovation inspiré à tout l'Enseignement français par la défaite de 1871, et aux travaux déjà remarquables d'une école linguistique française illustrée dès les années 1880 et suivantes par des noms tels que ceux de Paul Passy, de Pinloche, de Gouin, de Gourio, et plus tard de l'Abbé Rousselot, à une époque où d'ailleurs, comme vous le savez, la linguistique faisait des progrès révolutionnaires en Angleterre, en Allemagne, au Danemark. Des cette époque, en France, les spécialistes préconisaient la méthode qu'on appela d'abord "Méthode naturelle", puis "Méthode Active" ou encore "Méthode directe": celle qui emploie presque constamment et presque dès le début, en classe, la langue enseignée. Les programmes de 1902 en recommandent très fortement, ou même en impose l'emploi. Ils créent dans les lycées des sections B et D où l'on enseigne aux élèves qui les fréquentent deux langues étrangères, et non plus une seule. Les autorités responsables orientent de plus en plus alors l'étude des langues vers la connaissance de la langue *parlée* et s'efforcent avant tout de lui donner un caractère *pratique*. Cependant, beaucoup de professeurs français se refusaient encore à utiliser les méthodes préconisées officiellement. Ils considéraient l'étude d'une langue avant tout comme un *moyen* de compléter la formation humaniste et littéraire donnée aux jeunes gens par l'étude du latin et du français, en leur faisant lire, expliquer et traduire de bons textes, tires des meilleurs auteurs étrangers, beaucoup plus que comme une *fin* en soi. D'après eux, il s'agissait de leur faire mieux comprendre les hommes en acquérant la connaissance d'une ou deux grandes littératures et civilisations étrangères, plutôt que de leur apprendre à commander un déjeuner en anglais ou en allemand, ou à soutenir une conversation avec un étranger sur les choses de la vie courante. D'ailleurs, tout Français est intimement convaincu que, des qu'il sort de France pour aller en Angleterre ou en Allemagne, il n'a plus besoin de savoir commander un déjeuner; il n'a qu'à laisser venir ce qui viendra, car il sait très bien qu'il n'a plus aucune chance de manger: il ne peut plus que se nourrir. Ces deux tendances, l'une pratique et dirigée vers la connaissance de la langue parlée, l'autre humaniste et reposant sur l'étude des textes, se juxtaposent encore aujourd'hui dans l'enseignement des langues étrangères en France. On s'est efforcé de les concilier, et nous allons les retrouver en étudiant très rapidement d'abord la formation des maîtres, puis les programmes et les méthodes aux divers degrés de l'enseignement.

Formation des Maîtres -- Vous savez qu'en France on n'apprend à peu près pas les langues étrangères dans l'enseignement primaire, si l'on met à part quelques expériences qui ont été faites récemment, et sur lesquelles je n'ai pas le temps de m'étendre; c'est en somme dans l'enseignement secondaire et dans l'enseignement superieur qu'on les étudie. Donc, je vous parlerai de la formation des maîtres pour l'enseignement secondaire, et pour l'enseignement superieur et universitaire. Je n'ai pas le temps de vous donner beaucoup de détails; je veux simplement vous rappeler que l'on cherche à donner aux maîtres d'une part un maniement aisé de la langue pour qu'ils sachent la parler couramment devant leurs élèves, mais aussi une bonne connaissance du pays étranger, de sa littérature, de sa civilisation, et enfin la connaissance des moyens scolaires, parascolaires et périscolaires qui permettent de se perfectionner dans la connaissance de la langue. Vous savez que les maîtres qui veulent enseigner les langues étrangères dans les écoles secondaires ou les universités de France doivent *se spécialiser* dans l'étude d'une langue. Dans un lycée français, le professeur d'anglais n'enseignera pas l'anglais, le français et la botanique; il enseignera l'anglais, peut-être aussi une seconde langue s'il n'y a pas d'autre professeur pour l'enseigner. Il doit avoir passé une licence d'enseignement qui comporte cinq certificats. Je ne peux pas vous donner tous les détails, mais il est certain que celui qui a déjà obtenu cette licence a surmonté beaucoup d'obstacles, et qu'il a une bonne connaissance de la langue, de la littérature et de la civilisation de la Grande-Bretagne, d'autant plus que la plupart des étudiants qui préparent cette licence essaient de passer une année à l'étranger pendant le cours de leurs 3 années d'études: études elle-mêmes difficiles. A chacun de ces certificats, il y a des examens écrits et oraux. On estime qu'à peu près 50% des candidats échouent à la licence d'enseignement des langues étrangères. Vient ensuite un examen plus difficile, qui est le C.A.P.E.S* Le C.A.P.E.S. comporte à la fois une préparation théorique -- là encore il y a des épreuves écrites et orales -- et d'autre part une formation pratique et pédagogique: pendant un an, le candidat au CAPES doit faire des stages d'enseignement sous la direction de conseillers pédagogiques, et il assiste à un certain nombre de conférences générales et de cours universitaires sur les méthodes d'enseignement de la langue qu'il a choisie. Puis vient le diplôme d'études supérieures: il comporte la rédaction d'une petite thèse, moins difficile évidemment que celle du doctorat, mais souvent écrite dans la langue étrangère choisie. Enfin, l'agrégation est un concours, très difficile comme vous le savez. Il est destiné à sélectionner les meilleurs professeurs pour l'enseignement secondaire, mais aussi ceux qui, plus tard, prépareront des doctorats pour devenir professeurs d'Université. Celui qui a réussi à l'agrégation doit en effet, pour obtenir le doctorat d'état, qui est, en principe, nécessaire pour enseigner dans une université, travailler encore pendant 5 ou 6 ans, quelquefois 10 ans sur un sujet de recherche très spécialisé. Bref, les études sont longues, difficiles et approfondies.

Je voudrais maintenant vous parler des programmes et des méthodes dans l'enseignement secondaire, car c'est là, en somme, que la plupart des jeunes Français apprennent les langues étrangères. Ces méthodes et ces programmes sont définis par le Ministère de l'Education Nationale. Vous savez en effet que l'enseignement public en France est fortement centralisé, que les professeurs de l'enseignement public sont nommés par le Ministère, qu'ils sont contrôlés et notés par des inspecteurs généraux qui, après avoir assisté à une de leurs classes, corrigent leurs erreurs et leur donnent des conseils, et qu'ils reçoivent des instructions écrites, élaborées précisément par le Corps des Inspecteurs Généraux. Enfin, tous ces professeurs préparent leurs élèves à des examens et à des concours qui sont règlementés par l'Etat. Même dans les établissements libres les professeurs qui, eux, ne sont pas nommés par le Gouvernement, doivent aussi préparer les enfants à des examens d'Etat et, par conséquent, plus ou moins, se soumettre à une doctrine officielle. C'est de cette doctrine officielle qui je voudrais vous dire quelques mots.

*Certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement secondaire.

Tout d'abord, le nombre des langues enseignées dans les lycées est officiellement limité à 7. Naturellement dans certaines sections on apprend une seule langue, mais, je vous l'ai dit tout à l'heure, dans d'autres sections on en apprend deux. Nous appelons première langue celle qui est apprise à partir de la classe de 6ème, c'est-à-dire à partir de 10 ou 11 ans en général, pendant 6 ans, de 3 à 5 heures par semaine suivant les années et les sections. La dernière année, on ne fait plus qu'une heure et demie de langue étrangère. Là, c'est l'anglais qui a nettement la prépondérance; les trois-quarts des élèves le choisissent comme première langue; à peu près un cinquième choisit l'allemand, qui avait beaucoup reculé à la fin de la dernière guerre, mais qui a maintenant dépassé l'espagnol (troisième place); vient enfin l'italien. Quant à la deuxième langue, on l'apprend seulement pendant quatre ans, à raison de 3 ou 4 heures par semaine. Ici, c'est maintenant l'allemand qui tient la première place: à peu près le tiers des élèves qui apprennent une deuxième langue étrangère choisissent l'allemand; viennent ensuite l'espagnol, puis l'anglais, puis l'italien, puis le russe, qui a commencé à progresser même dans l'enseignement secondaire, et enfin l'arabe et le portugais. Voilà les 7 langues admises officiellement dans les lycées francais et par conséquent au Baccalauréat.

Les programmes font preuve d'une grande souplesse. Il est entendu, naturellement, qu'on étudiera le vocabulaire, la grammaire, et la prononciation. Mais, pour le vocabulaire, par exemple, alors que les spécialistes estiment qu'on devrait apprendre à peu près 3000 mots pour avoir le maniement courant d'une langue, on n'oblige pas tous les professeurs à enseigner ces 3000 mots en 6 ans. On leur laisse toute liberté pour choisir ceux qu'ils enseigneront; on leur propose simplement dans chaque classe des centres d'intérêt: par exemple, la classe, la nourriture, le voyage, etc.. Pour la grammaire, on laisse aussi une très grande latitude aux professeurs en leur conseillant de progesser plus ou moins vite suivant les aptitudes des élèves. Pour la prononciation, enfin, on recommande fortement la prononciation Grande-Bretagne de préférence à celle des Etats-Unis. Le choix des textes est laissé aux professeurs, qui peuvent etiliser des textes suivis ou des morceaux choisis, ou encore des extraits qu'ils auront eux-mêmes fait ronéotyper pour les mettre à la disposition des élèves: ils ne sont pas obligés de les emprunter à des manuels approuvés. Pour les années qui précèdent le baccalauréat, on leur donne tout de même une liste d'oeuvres d'auteurs étrangers, mais cette liste est seulement indicative; lorsque l'élève arrive à l'examen, il doit présenter la liste des textes étudiés, contresignée par son professeur, et l'on admet à peu près n'importe quel livre.

Si les programmes comportent une grande souplesse, les méthodes, au contraire, font l'objet d'instructions très strictes. Les instructions de 1950, par exemple, qui n'ont guère été modifiées depuis, précisent que le but visé doit être "d'enseigner aux élèves, dès le début, à parler, puis à lire et à écrire correctement la langue élémentaire d'aujourd'hui; à exprimer oralement d'abord, les faits et les idées de la vie la plus générale." Vous voyez qu'on veut absolument orienter les élèves vers l'étude de la langue parlée. Cependant, les instructions ajoutent: "Cet enseignement s'appuie, à tous les échelons, sur des textes empruntés, dès que possible, à des ecrivains de qualité". Un peu plus loin, on insiste, en disant: "de beaux textes". Vous voyez qu'ici, c'est la conception humaniste de l'enseignement des langues qui reparaît: on s'efforce de l'associer à la conception pratique. Les instructions sont si détaillées qu'elles vont jusqu'à donner une sorte de schéma, de modèle de ce que doit être une classe d'anglais, d'allemand, d'espagnol, etc.. Par exemple, elles précisent que, pendant 10 minutes, on fera d'abord réciter la leçon par interrogation volante, en allant d'un élève à l'autre. Puis, pendant environ 15 minutes, on révisera le vocabulaire du texte que l'on aura étudié la fois précédente, tout en cherchant à faire acquérir de nouveaux mots pour l'étude de texte qui va être présenté aux élèves et qui est alors lu par le maître. Vient ensuite, pendant 20 minutes, une conversation qui, d'après les instructions, est la partie essentielle de la classe: entretien dirigé entre les élèves et le professeur, dans la langue étrangère, et se rapportant au texte qui vient d'être lu. On fait encore lire, par quelques élèves, des phrases choisies dans ce texte, on en met au point la diction, et c'est seulement à la fin de la classe que l'on entreprendra, si l'on en a le temps, de le traduire; sinon, les élèves le traduiront chez eux, mais alors, à la classe suivante, le professeur s'assurera qu'ils en ont bien compris le sens. Des indications très précises sont également données sur les leçons, les devoirs, etc..

Cette méthode est évidemment lente et minutieuse. Elle se heurte, dans son application, à des difficultés assez grandes, du fait que, maintenant, les effectifs sont trop nombreux et trop hétérogènes pour toutes sortes de raisons, sociales, administratives et autres. C'est ainsi qu'en moyenne, un expert français a calculé qu'un élève français, pendant ses 7 années d'enseignement secondaire, a l'occasion, en classe, de parler à peu près 7 heures la langue qu'on lui enseigne, alors que, si l'on applique le même calcul à un élève belge, on arrive à 28 heures, c'est-à-dire 4 fois plus. On a cherché à remédier à cette insuffisance par divers procédés, par exemple en divisant les classes en demi-sections pendant une ou deux heures par semaine, en organisant des classes de rattrapage au niveau de la seconde, c'est-à-dire vers 14-15 ans pour les élèves qui sont en retard, ou encore en faisant venir en France des assistants étrangers. C'est une chose extrêmement importante. Il y en a maintenant un millier ou même un peu plus chaque année, mille jeunes anglais, américains, canadiens, italiens, espagnols, allemands, qui sont généralement des étudiants avancés ou de jeunes professeurs. Ils viennent passer un an en France dans un établissement secondaire. A raison d'environ 12 heures par semaine, ils réunissent des volontaires au nombre de 6 ou 8 par séance et ils s'entretiennent avec eux. Ils apportent en somme la présence vivante de leur pays dans l'enseignement des langues étrangères en France. Ils animent des clubs, où l'on organise des discussions, des représentations théâtrales, des chants et des danses, où l'on présente des films qu'ils commentent, etc..

Naturellement, on emploie aussi les auxiliaires audio-visuels. On l'a fait avant même que l'expression ait existé, puisque l'Inspection Générale, depuis très longtemps, recommandait, par exemple, l'usage des tableaux muraux pour présenter les objets les plus simples, celui des cartes postales, des photographies, des journaux illustrés. Maintenant, naturellement, et de plus en plus, on utilise les disques, les magnétophones, les films fixes ou animés en langue étrangère, la radio et la télévision. Certes, il y a des résistances, encore aujourd'hui, car beaucoup de professeurs français individualistes par tempérament, n'admettent guère la présence d'un autre professeur dans leur propre classe. Or la radio ou la télévision en classe, c'est précisément un autre professeur qui vient vous faire concurrence; on peut se demander si la comparaison sera toujours à l'avantage du professeur habituel...Il y a d'ailleurs beaucoup d'établissements qui ne sont pas munis d'appareils de télévision. Les disques, naturellement, sont plus maniables et beaucoup plus répandus.

Enfin, d'autres moyens sont employés pour améliorer la connaissance des langues. De plus en plus, on voit se développer l'habitude des voyages à l'étranger pour les jeunes gens et même pour les enfants. Depuis 1946, le Ministère de l'Education Nationale a donné des instructions pour organiser systématiquement ce qu'on appelle les appariements d'écoles. Une école française, par exemple, s'associe avec une école allemande, une école anglaise, ou une école espagnole. Sous la direction du directeur et du professeur de langue, on organise des voyages en groupe. Les élèves vont passer trois semaines ou un mois dans l'école ainsi jumelée avec celle à laquelle ils appartiennent; puis ils reçoivent la visite de leurs camarades étrangers. Ces jumelages ont donné d'excellents résultats. Il y a aussi les jumelages de villes, les échanges de groupes entre villes jumelées, les rencontres internationales, les camps de moisson, enfin les expériences de stages ou de visites semi-professionnelles organisées dans le domaine de l'enseignement technique: de jeunes élèves de l'enseignement technique français vont faire un stage à l'étranger dans établissement correspondant à leur spécialité, ce qui leur permet d'acquérir le vocabulaire professionnel de cette spécialité dans la langue étrangère qu'ils apprennent.

Mais je m'aperçois que j'ai déjà largement dépassé le temps qui m'était imparti. Je conclurai qu'au fond, le grand problème que doivent résoudre en France, actuellement, les spécialistes des langues étrangères est celui qu'on retrouve dans tous les autres secteurs de l'enseignement: celui d'une démocratisation qui doit se faire sans abaisser le niveau de cet enseignement. Les élèves sont de plus en plus nombreux et viennent de milieux de plus en plus différents, alors qu'autrefois l'enseignement des langues étrangères était réservé a une minorité de jeunes gens venant surtout de la bourgeoisie. Les pessimistes diront, évidemment, que les méthodes françaises, cherchant à atteindre dux buts, un but pratique et un but humaniste, manqueront forcément les deux, et que les professeurs n'obtiendront que des résultats médiocres d'un côté comme de l'autre. Les optimistes, dont je suis, estiment que ces deux buts sont parfaitement conciliables, que des méthodes éprouvées ont été forgées, que des maîtres parfaitement qualifiés sont formés chaque année, et que, par conséquent, il suffit maintenant, en y mettant le prix, de fournir à ces maîtres les moyens qui leur permettront de donner leur pleine mesure. C'est surtout une question d'argent, et donc une question de Gouvernement: le problème n'est nullement insoluble.

Current Programs --
MODERN
LANGUAGE
TEACHING
in
FRANCE

by
Francois Weymuller
Cultural Counsellor
French Embassy
Ottawa

A few centuries ago, the people of France did not care to learn any foreign language; and after all, why should they, as long as they stayed in Europe? As you know, during the 17th and 18th centuries, any person who belonged to the educated elite spoke French, -- even the animals, at the time when it is said that the animals could speak! (At least according to our fairy tales.) Therefore, in France, whoever wanted to study, would rather study Latin and sometimes Greek.

On the eve of the French Revolution in 1789, a French author wrote: "If it is not clear, it is not French." It took only a small step from that belief to the belief that "If it is not French, it is not clear." And most people in France took this step so easily. Why get all mixed up? Why learn a foreign language?

Yet, it was precisely because of the Revolution that things started to change. The French nation now needed the other nations of Europe, and they soon found out that it would be advisable to speak the language of these people, rather than to expect them to speak French. If you believe in Freedom, Equal Rights for All, and Brotherhood, you must admit that you should at least try to understand your brethren even should it happen that they do not speak the language which, by rights, should become the Universal Language. That is, of course, the French Language.

Thus, the Convention of 1794 replaced the Old Regime's colleges by opening the first central schools, which were forerunners to the lyceums later created by Napoleon Bonaparte. The same Convention introduced the teaching of modern languages in these schools, but its learning was optional.

It was still optional under the reign of Charles X. The regulations of the 26th of March 1829 decided that there would be two hours each week devoted to the study of modern languages during the first four years in a lyceum, in other words, in high school. But only students eager to learn a modern language would attend these classes.

It was only in 1840 that the teaching of a modern language became compulsory in the French high schools. The students would be taught grammar and a small amount of vocabulary during the first year. In the second year they would translate from and into the new language, and only upon starting the third year would the teacher be compelled to give a lecture in the foreign language from time to time, and the students would be asked to sum up his talk while using their newly-acquired language.

But the directives given to the teachers were rather vague and the general feeling was unfavorable. The high school principals were strongly opposed to its expansion and would, for example, set a very inconvenient time for these classes so that many students could not attend them.

It is only during the last hundred years that, due to ministerial directives given in 1863, to an effort made to renovate the French educational system after the defeat of 1871, and to the remarkable work done by a French linguistic school around the years 1880 and after, and with the help of noted men like Paul Passy, Pinloche, Gouin, Gourio and later Father Rousselot, that the teaching of modern languages has gained some ground in our schools and that the methods and the planning have been improved and an adequate teaching staff formed and trained at a time when, as you may know, the linguists in England, Germany and Denmark were progressing very rapidly.

Well, at that time, French experts advocated the method called Natural Method, and later the Active Method (also called Direct Method), that is, a method by which you start almost at once to use, in class, the language you are being taught. The school programs in 1902 recommend this method and even impose its use. New sections, B and D, are opened in high schools where two languages are being taught instead of one only.

The trend of the responsible authorities in the teaching of modern languages was then towards a knowledge of the spoken language. They were trying to emphasize its practical side. Yet many French teachers were still refusing to submit to the methods officially advanced. They thought of the study of a language not as a goal in itself but as a means of completing the humanistic and literary education given then to young people as in the case of Latin and Greek, by reading, explaining and translating texts selected from the best foreign authors.

According to them, it should have been a means to a better understanding of other nations through the teaching of some good literary texts concerning this nation's civilization rather than to enable them to order a meal in English or in German or to hold a conversation with them about everyday life. Of course, every French person is convinced that there is no need to order a meal and he might as well eat what is served.

Well, even at the present time, these two tendencies, one practical and directed towards the spoken language, and the other humanistic and based on the study of texts, are being promoted side by side in the teaching of modern languages in France. In our brief study of the training of the teaching staff, the planning and the different methods used in the teaching of modern languages at each step of the educational system, you will see that efforts have been made to integrate these two tendencies.

About the training of the teaching staff: You know that, in France, modern languages are not taught in grade schools except in some recent test cases about which I will not speak here now. Let us say that the modern languages are taught particularly in high schools and colleges. Therefore, I will speak about the training of the high school, college and university teaching staff.

I would not have the time to give you all these details, and I only want to remind you of the efforts made to enable the teachers to handle the spoken language with ease in front of their pupils, and to give them a fair knowledge of the country involved, its literature, its civilization, and also to help them to know the possibilities offered them during the school term, before the school term and after the school term, that would provide them with an even better knowledge of this language.

You know that to become a teacher of modern languages in a high school or a university in France, a student has to specialize in a language. You would not find, for instance, in a French high school, a professor teaching English, French and Botany, but he would teach English only, or perhaps another modern language if there was no other professor available. Therefore, he must obtain a teaching degree consisting of five certificates. I do not want to go into detail but it is certain that whoever has obtained this degree has had to surmount many obstacles and that he will possess a very good knowledge of the language, the literature, the civilisation, especially since most of the students preparing these degrees will spend at least one year out of the three-year course in the country where this modern language is spoken. This three-year course means a lot of hardship and for each of these five certificates, there are oral and written tests. It is believed that about 50 percent of the students will fail the Modern Language Teaching Degree.

Then on to the next exam! Much more difficult, the C.A.P.E.S*, for which the training consists of, on the one hand a theoretical training (and there again written and oral tests are given) and, on the other hand, a practical, one-year pedagogic training. The candidate to the C.A.P.E.S. has to undergo several training periods under the supervision of pedagogic counsellors and he will then have to attend a number of general lectures and university courses on the methods of teaching the modern language he has chosen.

Then we come to the bachelor's degree (some sort of a thesis). This is kind of a doctorate, though a doctorate would be much more difficult.

The next step up is the "agrégation", which is a competition. This competition, as you may know, is very difficult and its purpose is to select the best professors for high school and college teaching, and also students who will then go on to the doctorate to become university professors.

After having successfully prepared the state doctorate (which is a must to teach in a university) there might be another five, six or even 10 years of hard work involving very particular research work.

In France, lengthy examinations are necessary to obtain a state doctorate.

I don't have time to speak more extensively about the training of the teaching staff. I would prefer to speak about the planning and the methods of high school and college teaching as, after all, this is where most of the young French students are taught modern languages. The National Education Ministry defines these methods and planning. You know, of course, that in France, the public education system is completely centralized, that its teaching staff is selected by the Ministry and that they are supervised by a Board of General Inspectors. These Inspectors preside over their classes, correct their errors, andgive them good advice. The teaching staff receives directives which are minutely prepared by this Board of General Inspectors. You also may know that the teaching staff has to prepare its pupils for the examinations and competitions which are ruled by the state.

Even the private institutions, whose teaching staff is not nominated by the government, still have to prepare their pupils for the state examinations, and therefore they have to submit themselves.

*Certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement secondaire more or less to these official doctrines. And it is about these official doctrines that I will now speak.

First of all, the number of modern languages officially taught in high schools is limited to seven languages. Of course, in some sections only one language is taught, as I told you earlier, and two languages in other sections.

What we call the "prime language" is precisely the language started in Grade six, at the age of 10 or 11. This language is taught for six years at a rate of three to five hours per week, depending on the grade and the section, except in Section A. During the last of these years, only about one-and-a-half hours per week is devoted to the study of modern languages.

As a prime language, English is the most popular. About three-quarters of the students will choose English, about one-fifth will take German. German has gained on Spanish and thus has pushed it back to third rank, with Italian being next.

The second language is only taught for four years at a rate of three to four hours per week. As a second language, German is the most popular and is chosen by about one-third of the students. Of course English being the most popular as the prime language, there cannot be a large proportion left for the second language. Therefore, German is at the top, then Spanish, English, Italian and Russian. (Russian has gained some popularity and is now taught even at the high school level.) After these four principle modern languages, (five if you include Russian) come Arabic and Portuguese. These are the seven languages officially taught in French high schools and colleges and are therefore accepted at the examinations for the bachelor's degree.

The school programs prove to be very weak. Of course, let it be understood that vocabulary, grammar and pronounciation will be taught, but let us take, for instance, vocabulary. According to the French experts, you should learn around 3,000 words to be able to handle properly a language. Well, no professor is compelled to teach these famous 3,000 words during the six years. They are left absolutely free to choose which words they will teach. Only suggestions are made to them as to what their lessons should be centered around, as for instance, the classroom, food, travel, etc..

As for grammar, the teaching staff is given great freedom. They are told to progress at the best rate they can according to the aptitudes of their students. As far as pronunciation is concerned, the "Great Britain" pronunciation is much more favored than the "United States" pronunciation. The choice of texts is also left to the teaching staff, and they may choose either texts with sequences, short, selected texts, or even texts that they may mimeograph to distribute to their students. They are not compelled to use texts from approved handbooks. During the years preceeding the examinations for the bachelor's degree, there is a list available of selected texts of foreign authors, but this list is only given as a general reference. When the student reports for the examination, he must bring a list of the texts he has studied, signed by his professor. Almost any book or text is acceptable.

As you see, the programs are very expendable, but the methods are submitted to very strict directives. The 1950 directives, for example, (they are the latest given and have only slightly been changed since they are the basis of teaching modern languages in high schools and colleges) are of the opinion that students should be taught, right from the start, to speak, then to read and later to write correctly to enable them to talk and express facts and ideas concerning everyday life. You may note that the trend is definitely towards the spoken language, and yet the directives are very specific when they mention also: "These teaching methods should be based, at every stage, on texts taken, as soon as possible, from the best authors." And a little further on they insist they should be "beautiful texts."

You see, here the humanistic conception of the teaching of modern languages reappears and it has to compromise with the practical conception. Well, the directives given are so accurate that they even give a kind of diagram as an example of how an English, German, or Spanish class should be run. Although I do not want to give you here all the details, let me say, for instance, that it is stated that for 10 minutes the lesson should be recited with the help of questions going from one student to another; then for about 15 minutes there should be a vocabulary revision based on the text discussed during the previous lesson; then a period for learning the new words necessary to the understanding of the next text chosen. This new text is then read to the students by the teacher and for about 20 minutes there should be a little talk which, according to the directives, is the most essential part of this class and should therefore be held in the foreign language between students and professor. At the same time students will read chosen sentences from this text. The pronunciation is perfected and only at the end of these lessons, that is, if there is still some time left, will the translation of this text be attempted. Translation is thus often left to be done as homework. In this case, at the next lesson it will be checked and corrected to see if the students have been able to translate adequately this text which had been, after all, explained to them. Very precise directives are also given concerning the lessons, the homework, etc..

Well, this method is evidently very slow and meticulous, and its application meets with great difficulties, difficulties due to the fact that nowadays, classes have too many pupils, from too many different backgrounds, and difficulties due also to all kinds of social, administrative and other reasons. But a French expert has figured that a young French boy, during his seven years in high school or college, will have had the opportunity to talk the language, in class, for approximately seven hours. Yet the same figures for Belgium show that a little Belgian boy would have been able to speak an average of 28 hours, that is, four times more.

Evidently, this comparison is to the benefit of the Belgian educational system, but attempts are made to remedy the shortage by applying various methods: for instance, by dividing the classes into sections and sub-sections, and starting in Grade 10, that is, at the age of 14 or 15, and to organize classes for one or two hours each week, to help the weaker students. Also, by having foreign assistants come to France. This matter is extremely important. For the last few years, and at the present time, I think there are about a thousand young students coming from Great Britain, the United States, Canada, Italy, Spain and Germany, to spend one year in France, either in a high school or in a college. They have sufficient background to be able to conduct practice classes in the capacity of teachers. They are close to the students and they spend an average of 12 hours per week with willing students, at a rate of six to eight students per sitting.

Well, these young foreign assistants add the living presence of their own countries in the teaching of modern languages in France. And this is very important. They live in groups and have debates, play little animated sketches, sing, dance, give movie shows etc.... and of course, audio-visual aids are also used. These have existed and been used long before this expression came into being, as the General Inspectors long ago recommended the use, for instance, of mural boards and maps to show simple objects to the students, as well as postcards, photographs, illustrated magazines, and now, of course, more and more records, tapes, and movies.

Radio and television should also be mentioned. Here again, this will meet with a lot of resistance from many a French teacher, who is, just as every other French person, a strong individualist, and will not admit the presence of another teacher in his class. Well, even radio and television represent another teacher who comes and competes with him, and by God, you may really wonder if the result would be in favor of the teacher who is there in the flesh, so of course there is a strong resistance. On the other hand, many schools are not equipped with radios and television sets, and therefore the use of radio and television has had a slow start. Still projections (filmstrips) are easier to handle and therefore most widely employed.

Anyway, there are still other means, and particularly the spreading of travel to foreign countries for young people and even children. Since 1946, for instance, the Ministry of Education has given instructions for the systematic organization of what is called "school matching." This means, for instance, that a French school will be associated with a German, an English or a Spanish school, and under the supervision of the principal and the teachers, group travel will be organized for the students who will spend three weeks or one month in the school that has been paired off with their own. The foreign students will come to France. They usually come around Easter and stay three weeks or one month. The little French boys will then usually go there in the early part of the summer. The fact is that this pairing of schools brings wonderful results. There is also the pairing off of cities, letter exchanges between these cities, and all the international meetings, and so on....

And finally there are the experiments made through exchanges and semi-professional visits organized in the technical education field. Young technical school students in France are sent to a well-known district in a foreign country, and there they will learn the professional vocabulary.

There are many more ways also, such as the postal exchange.

In summary, the biggest problem modern language experts in France must solve,at the present time, is the problem that comes up in every other field of the educational system in France, and that is the problem of the democratization that has to be done without lowering too much the level of the educational system.

There are more and more students and they come from a more varied social background. And this was not the case before, when the teaching of modern languages was more or less addressed only to a minority of young people belonging to the middle class.

Pessimists, of course, will say that the French methods of trying to reach two goals at the same time, one practical and one humanistic, will be a total failure for both aims, and that the teachers will only obtain mediocre results one way and the other.

But the optimists, and I belong to them, think that these two goals are perfectly reconcilable, that the methods that have been tried out have proved to be basically good methods, that perfectly qualified teachers are formed each year, and that therefore, if we are willing to pay the price, we will be able to give these teachers the means that will enable them to do their very best. And this is then mostly a question of money, a question, shall we say, of government. But it is a question to which an answer can be easily found.

Current Programs --

MODERN
LANGUAGE
TEACHING
in
CANADA

(The following talk is based on the results of a questionnaire prepared by the CTF Research Division.)

by
Harvey R. Barnes
Head, Modern Languages Department
Sir Charles Tupper Secondary School
Vancouver

This is an attempt to present to you an up-to-date picture of the situation in Canada regarding the teaching of second languages. The sources of the information I will present are:

1. The questionnaires sent to and returned by participants in this Seminar, devised by the CTF.
2. The questionnaires, also devised by the CTF for this Seminar, completed by officials of the Departments of Education in the 10 provinces.
3. The very able and scholarly thesis of Mr. Neil Maclean Purvis, submitted September 1961, surveying the teaching of a second language to English-speaking Canadian schoolchildren of Grades one to nine.
4. DBS reviews on population statistics.
5. Other pertinent literature, including reports prepared by provincial and district education authorities in some provinces.

The source of any opinion which creeps into this presentation must inevitably and unashamedly be myself.

It would be as well to define the term "second language" and what it implies in this report.

It means a language or languages other than the native language, other than the language used in day-to-day life.

This means, to be more specific, a language other than English to most Canadians.

It means a language other than French to many Canadians in many different parts of Canada, but concentrated for the most part in a predominant area.

It means a language second to their native one for a number of smaller groups, a considerable number of individuals, who are non-English and non-French-speaking.

> (Immigration, for example, brings to Canada thousands of non-English-speaking and non-French-speaking people yearly. Presumably, the school-age proportion of immigrants is helped by attendance in New Canadian classes to cope with the task of acquiring familiarity with the language of instruction -- English or French -- in the schools they attend.)

This last group will not be described separately in this report.

To what extent is the learning of a second language required or insisted on in Canadian schools? This is: a language second to the basic language of instruction. i.e. second to English in most parts of Canada or second to French in some parts of Canada.

> (Remember that a second language may in turn become a language of instruction, but still be second to the prevailing official language of instruction.)

Four provinces require such second language study by all students to the following extent:

In P.E.I.		French	8 - 12	
In N.B.		French	5 - 12	(although there appears to be some discrepancy in survey returns here)
		English	3 - 12	
In P.Q.	(Cath.)	French	4 - 12	
		English	5 - 12	
	(Prot.)	French	3 - 12	
In B.C.		French	8	(This is the first year of such a requirement in B.C. It allows exceptions by consultation between parent and principal, but there appears to be over 90

percent participation, hence
it has sneaked into this
survey under required study.)

To augment the foregoing, what is the extent of second language instruction permitted in the provinces, i.e. allowed by Departments of Education to be incorporated in curriculum locally, or for that matter provincially? (But not in the sense of subjects elected by students; a local board may insist on 100 percent participation. No specific picture concerning the latter distinction will be attempted here.)

Some of these permitted programs are possible additions to curriculum in which no required second language is to be found.

Some are permissive extensions up or down the grades, adding to existing required programs.

With the exception of P.Q. (Cath.) all provincial school systems appear to show permitted second language programs.

In P.Q. (Prot.) -- French 1 and 2 permitted -- an extension -- making possible Grade 1-12 French program. (e.g. Montreal and Pointe Claire have this. Montreal also has an English 1-9 program; it is hoped to extend this into Grades 10 and 11.) In P.Q. (Prot.) German is permitted in grades 10, 11 and 12. Spanish is permitted in 10 and 11.

In N.B. -- French 3 and 4 is permitted -- an extension -- making possible Grade 3-12 program. English 2 is permitted -- an extension -- making possible Grade 2-12 program. (e.g. Moncton offers French 5-11 and 13.)

In P.E.I. -- French 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 permitted -- extensions up and down. (Charlottetown has French 3, 4, 5, and 6, in fact French 3-13 program. French 1 and 2 hoped for soon.) German is permitted in Grades 11, 12 and 13.

In B.C. -- French 6 and 7 is permitted -- an extension. (French in Grade 8 is a requirement, remember.) French 9-13 is permitted. German 9-13 is permitted. Spanish 9-13 is permitted. Russian for two consecutive years in Grades 10-13.

(The foregoing constitutes, in the case of French and English, extensions on a permissive basis to courses which are required of all students.)

In N.S. -- Both English and French 3-12 are permitted. (In Meteghan River, however, an English program in Grades 1-12 is offered.) German is permitted in 10, 11 and 12.

In Ontario -- French 3-13 is permitted or 4-13 (discrepancy in returns). (Cornwall offers a Grade 3-13 program with plans to extend, with collaboration between public and separate systems.) (Ottawa public (elementary) program extends from 2-8. Ottawa separate complete program extends from 3-13, with hopes of extension to Grade 2.) English 7-13 is permitted. German, Spanish, Russian 10-13 are permitted. Italian is permitted, but data is not clear.

In Newfoundland -- French 5-11 is permitted. (St. John's -- French 5-12 program is offered, and here the instroduction of French in the elementary grades is being further encouraged.) German and Spanish in Grades 9, 10 and 11 are permitted.

In Manitoba -- French 4-12 is permitted. (In St. Boniface the 4-6 French for "major work" classes only, but plans to extend to all 4-6.) German 7-12 is permitted. (In Winkler a complete program of German 1-12 is in effect, with plans for further strengthening of this instruction in elementary grades.) Ukrainian is permitted in Grade 10, with extension to 11 and 12 planned for the next two years.

In Saskatchewan -- French 6-12 is permitted. German and Ukrainian 9-12 are permitted.

In Alberta -- French 7-12 is permitted. (In Calgary, Grade 4-12 French program is offered -- an experimental TV French program for selected Grade 4 and 5 classes, with extension to 6 planned for next year. It is hoped to offer this program shortly to all classes in Calgary.) German 10, 11 and 12 is permitted. Ukrainian in Grades 11 and 12 is permitted.

No account has been attempted of detailed course content in the developments of second language teaching. One might mention in passing, new programs in German in Alberta, in French in many districts of Ontario and Quebec (trilingual school), in Calgary, and in B.C. There is new work in Russian, and so on.

It would appear then that in six provinces there is no grade in which a second language is required of all students, and in only four provinces is there such a requirement insisted upon at any grade level. The permitted programs would complete the picture.

However, this is not quite the whole picture. We must add this aspect: that most, if not all, provincial education departments (-- the cautious wording is simply on account of the absence of clear data in the case of four provinces --) insist on the study of a second language for university-bound students. When this is taken into consideration, a much more complete picture of required programs in second languages is obtained. For this I will spare you the details, since they present a jungle of complications -- who should, who must, for how long, and at what levels -- very difficult to summarize.

Now let us turn to this question:

> How much time is allotted in the curriculum to study of a second language?

There is a wide variety of time allotment.

In the lower grades in elementary and junior high courses, wherever the program is a required one, liberal allotments seem to be the thing -- 90, 100, 120, 150 minutes per week are evident. Where the program is permitted, 50, 60, 75, 90 minutes per week are noted, with one hour per week about average, although time allotments of 100, 120, 135, 150 and even 180-200 minutes exist in some provinces.

In senior grades, from 10-13, where the subject is a required one, it is very difficult to sift out figures, since "required" here means in many cases "required for university-bound students", in which case there are quite incomplete statistics when one attempts to analyze the returns from questionnaires.

In permitted second language courses, it would appear that an average time allotment would be something just under 200 minutes per week.

It is interesting to note that in Manitoba the time allotted jumps from 198 minutes in Grade 11 to 297 in Grade 12. Do we detect the encouragement here to cram?

> What percentages of students study second languages?

Firstly, it must be mentioned that where the program is required, the percentage is of course 100. (Except in B.C. where the Grade 8 course in French allows special exclusions.)

When we turn to permitted programs, it is difficult if not impossible to obtain adequate statistics for the elementary and junior secondary grades, since this is a developing field of second language programming, and is of a patchwork nature, from which percentages could scarcely be drawn.

In permitted programs in senior grades, percentages vary from 88 percent in Ontario to "very few" in P.Q. (Prot.). The high percentages are for French in all cases. Any other language attracts less than 10 percent of the student body in these grades, except in Manitoba, where the study of German is undertaken by 15 percent of students in Grade 11 and 11 percent in Grade 12.

> Have we the right teachers doing this job?

Once again, there is a major difficulty here, in that exact qualifications are generally not defined by provinces on the basis of subject specialization. Certification to teach is granted on a wider basis than this. However, in many instances, local district authorities are apparently expected to ensure that the appointment of teachers of second languages is made on the basis of an evaluation of their competency to teach the proposed language, plus, of course, the possession of an adequate teaching certificate.

It is worth noting that the most frequently mentioned special competency required by local authorities is oral competency or fluency. This would seem to have particular bearing on changing objectives in second language programs.

In three provinces, definitive conditions are stated of 1, 2 or 2+ (the latter a hope rather than an actual prerequisite) university courses in the language to be taught.

There are some figures in the returns from the questionnaires to Seminar participants which seem worthy of mention.

The majority of districts reporting state that the number of under-qualified teachers at present teaching a second language is under 10 percent. But, Trois Rivières (P.Q. Cath.) says 90 percent; Moncton says 50 percent; Vancouver says 30-50 percent or more; and Montreal (Prot.) says 20-40 percent.

All the latter are figures from Quebec districts where considerable expansion of courses is taking place.

Of some encouragement is the fact, emerging from the questionnaires returned by participants, that the fields of teacher training and in-service training are the most frequently mentioned of all special interests of the participants themselves.

What means are teachers adopting and authorities encouraging in second language teaching in Canada?

From what must be very incomplete data, we derive no lively picture here. Aural-oral approach and direct method seem to be receiving their fair share of attention. A few language laboratories exist where but a short time ago they did not. Tape recorders are seldom mentioned as being in use in school districts. (It may only be zeal in reporting which makes Vancouver appear to stand out in terms of the variety of techniques and aids in use there.) Programmed instruction of second languages has not yet attained significant importance in Canada. One district reports the use, one other the discussion of this development. Of some significance is the apparently considerable interest in linguistics reported by participants, although here one might be permitted to ask -- what type of linguistics?

May I, in conclusion, attempt to summarize the salient points and the problems arising from this survey.

1. The teaching of second languages is expanding. It is extending particularly downwards, to the younger grades. In this development much of the initiative appears to come from local districts, with a permissive attitude on the part of central authorities.

   This would seem to give rise to three major questions:

   (a) Where extension of second language instruction is taking place, how well can the different levels -- elementary, junior secondary and senior secondary -- of these programs be dovetailed together to form a desired continuum of instruction in a given district?

   (b) Can an adequate supply of properly qualified teachers be hoped for, far less assured? And at the same time, can we decide on what is meant by proper qualifications?

   (c) Is there emerging some evidence to indicate a belief that any second language program in any language in schools is worth more consideration than the old two or three years in senior grades idea?

2. In the form of a question: Who will be taught a second language at any given stage in their education?

3. New techniques are apparently receiving little attention as yet. Money, as we all know, is a major problem here, but surely not the only one. Again, in-service training would seem worth mentioning here, and I cannot resist mentioning the report by Dr. George Reith, Director of Education for the City of Edinburgh in Scotland in which he -- wonder of wonders -- points to the New World as his inspiration and proceeds to recommend (-- and this carries some weight there) the use of modern techniques in this field.

Finally, regarding the languages at present taught as second languages in Canada.

1. The vast area in which second language teaching is conducted is the area of the two official languages of this country; i.e. French and English as second languages.

2. There is a considerable area of second language teaching outside of French and English in which the language taught is that of an ethnic group in the district concerned.

3. There is very little evidence to indicate that second languages are taught in Canadian schools principally for reasons other than these first two. (Indeed, in Mr. Purvis's survey, local districts gave most frequently the existence of a bilingual community as the reason for instituting second language programs.)

We appear then to have a situation in which domestic considerations predominate. Perhaps we should resolve these considerations to our satisfaction before showing our awareness of the need for second language programs which are prompted by international developments in the modern world.

And I add this note: In 1961, from January 1-13, there was held at Makerere College, Uganda, a Commonwealth conference of language educators. This conference was a result of the Commonwealth Education Conference held at Oxford in 1959. At the Uganda conference, the entire Commonwealth was well represented by delegates and observers, and the United States by observers. We Canadians were not represented there in either capacity.

The topic for the Conference? --

"The Teaching of English as a second language."

(The results of the questionnaire are included in the Appendix.)

APTITUDE
and
MOTIVATION:
THEIR
ROLE
in SECOND
LANGUAGE
ACQUISITION

by
Dr. R.C. Gardner
Assistant Professor of Psychology
University of Western Ontario

Although this Seminar is specifically concerned with modern language teaching, the material I wish to present is not concerned directly with teaching techniques. Instead it deals with two characteristics of the student which appear to considerably influence his success in second-language acquisition. These two characteristics include the students' (a) intellectual or cognitive abilities and (b) motivational qualities.

Although the results I am going to discuss were obtained from schools which use the so-called traditional method of second-language teaching, we have had the opportunity of conducting research in some schools which use language laboratories and thus far the results appear similar. Consequently, I think that what I am talking about today is applicable to a number of teaching techniques although, as I say, most of the results are based on the traditional methods of instruction.

Traditionally, second-language learning has been studied almost exclusively by educational psychologists and linguists who have been concerned with predicting which students will be successful in the acquisition of a foreign language. As early as 1920, researchers attempted to predict second-language achievement on the basis of such measures as general scholarship ratings, or grades in specific subjects, but as psychological testing developed, attention shifted to the use of special prognosis tests.

Prognosis tests, such as the "Iowa Foreign Language Aptitude Test", or the "Symonds Foreign Language Prognosis Test", measured the student's comprehension of the rules of grammar, his knowledge of English grammar, and his ability to learn a simple artificial language. Measures of these specific cognitive abilities, it was thought, provided the best index on which to base prediction of a student's subsequent success in language courses. Although such tests did predict grades in the language courses slightly better than standard intelligence tests, subsequent studies (particularly that by Wittenborn and Larsen) showed that these prognosis tests were highly dependent upon intelligence, and were better predictors only because they were not contaminated with those aspects of intelligence which were not specifically related to verbal skills. In other words, they appeared to omit performance abilities and other non-verbal skills typically measured in intelligence tests.

In 1954, Dr. J.B. Carroll of Harvard University undertook to develop a test of language aptitude which would improve prediction of language grades and would, at the same time, isolate those basic skills necessary for second-language acquisition. Starting with a large battery of tests which measured skills believed to be important, he conducted a number of studies where he determined the relationships between these tests and grades in language courses. By continual testing and refinement he eventually arrived at five tests which were consistently related to grades, but which at the same time, appeared to measure somewhat different skills. In 1959, these tests were published by The Psychological Corporation in combined form as the Modern Language Aptitude Test. The five sub-tests include:

(a) Number Learning. This test is believed to measure two components necessary for successful second-language acquisition -- general auditory alertness and immediate memory. Students are taught a new artificial language for the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 20, 30, 40, 100, 200, 300, and 400, after which they are required to write down three-digit-numbers (such as 312) as they are dictated in the new language. All instruction and testing is by means of a tape recording, and students are not permitted to see any written script.

(b) Phonetic Script. This test is a measure of the student's ability to associate speech sounds. In this test, sets of four syllables are presented by means of the tape recorder, and as each syllable is heard, the student reads from his answer sheet the orthographic script corresponding to it. After five sets of four syllables each are presented, one syllable from each of the sets is repeated in order, and the student indicates on his answer sheet the one he believes is correct.

(c) Spelling Clues. This test measures the student's English vocabulary knowledge, as well as his ability to associate particular symbols with the appropriate sounds. No tape recorder is required for this part. Disguised (phonetic) spellings of words are printed in the test booklet, and after each one, five English words are given, one of which has a meaning similar to the disguised word. For example, the disguised word "luv" is followed by the five words, (a) carry, (b) exist, (c) affection, (d) wash, (e) spy. The student should choose alternative "c" as the correct one since "affection" is most similar in meaning to "luv" which is a disguised spelling of the English word "love".

(d) Words in Sentences. This test measures the student's sensitivity to grammatical structure. It consists of a number of written sentences presented two at a time. One word from the first sentence in each pair is underlined, while five words (or phrases) from the second sentence are underlined. The student is instructed to choose the word (or phrase) from the second sentence which performs the same function in that sentence as the underlined word does in the first sentence. Although this test does not use any grammatical terms, such as subject, predicate, preposition, etc., the student must be able to recognize the grammatical function of words.

(e) Paired Associates. This test is a measure of the student's rote memory skills. Twenty-four nonsense syllables are presented in a list along with their supposed English equivalents. Students are given a short time to learn the pairs, and are immediately tested for retention with a multiple choice test.

The Modern Language Aptitude test has extremely good validity coefficients. That is, scores in this test are generally highly correlated with grades in various language courses, indicating that the test does, in fact, measure skills which are important for second-language acquisition. Although we have used the test only with students studying French, and have obtained high validity coefficients in our studies, Dr. Carroll has shown that equally high validity coefficients are obtained with students studying other second languages. It may be of incidental interest to hear that I have recently attempted a modification of many of these sub-tests for use with blind students. Because of the "aural" nature of many of the sub-tests, such modifications are possible without substantially changing the structure of them. Preliminary results from two samples suggest that the modified tests are useful predictors of potentially successful blind students of a second language, even though for these students, the learning situation depends much more on oral-aural methods than is generally true for most sighted students.

Whereas Dr. Carroll has continually related the MLAT only to grades in language courses, we recently had the opportunity to determine not only the relationships of the sub-tests to skills in specific aspects of French achievement, but also the relationship of intelligence to both aptitude and achievement. Ninety-six English-speaking high school students in Louisiana who were enrolled in either first or second-year French were administered a group of tests measuring:

(a) language aptitude (MLAT)

(b) French achievement

(c) intelligence

The purpose of the study was to determine firstly whether or not there exists independent aspects of French achievement (such as oral skills, oral comprehension, etc. ..), and if these different aspects do exist, whether they are more dependent upon aptitude or intelligence. The procedure used to determine such aspects was a statistical technique known as factor analysis. This technique allows one to mathematically investigate the inter-relations (given in terms of correlation coefficients) of all the tests and to determine which of the tests form separate clusters (i.e. factors). If, for example, the aptitude tests and the intelligence tests fell in the same cluster, this would indicate that these two types of tests were measuring similar skills. If some of the measures of French achievement also appeared in the same cluster, this would in turn indicate that these measures of language aptitude and intelligence were in fact measuring skills important for these aspects of French achievement.

The actual results of the study indicated that in fact the various measures of language aptitude do measure skills which are important for second-language acquisition and that, for all practical purposes, intelligence is not related either to measures of French achievement or to Carroll's measures of language aptitude. This in turn suggests that measures of intelligence are not useful predictors of second-language achievement.

Specifically, the results indicated that it is possible to differentiate four independent aspects of French achievement, and that each of these aspects is highly related to one of the sub-tests of the MLAT. Briefly, the following factors, or clusters were attained:

1. French Oral Reading -- the ability to read a standard French passage fluently, and with an accurate European accent. This component of French achievement was highly dependent upon the Number Learning Test -- which measures a special auditory alertness factor as well as memory skills. That this is related to the ability to read French suggests that students with this skill are able to recognize pronunciation differences, and to remember these differences for subsequent production.

2. French Vocabulary Knowledge -- including knowing the English equivalents of French words, correct French word-endings, word pronunciation, and "in-context" word meanings. The Phonetic Script Test was clearly associated with this factor suggesting that the ability to code unfamiliar auditory material and remember it, plays an important function in retaining a complete knowledge of French vocabulary.

3. Language Course Grades -- including a knowledge of French grammar. This cluster indicated that the class tests the teachers used were probably greatly dependent upon the grammatical aspects of French -- a finding with which the teachers agreed. The Words in Sentences Test from the MLAT was highly associated with this factor suggesting that the student who is familiar with the grammatical structure of his own language will be able to transfer this knowledge to other languages, and consequently learn this aspect of the other language well.

4. Relative French Sophistication -- The chief characteristic of tests in this cluster was their difficulty for students at this level. The two measures of French achievement on this factor included one that required students to comprehend complex, fluent French conversations and to answer questions given in French about them, and the other which required complex, fluent and accurate spontaneous Oral Production in French. The Spelling Clues Test was clearly associated with this cluster.

In addition to these four aspects of French achievement, three other clusters were also found. Two of these were composed of the measures of intelligence, one made up of the measures of general intelligence, the other of verbal intelligence, particularly as measured by English vocabulary tests.

The final cluster was composed of all the measures of language aptitude. That is, although four of the sub-tests do in fact measure abilities which are of direct importance for acquiring skill in specific aspects of French achievement, all five of the sub-tests also tend to have considerable in common. Dr. Carroll has similarly noted this communality, and has interpreted it as reflecting a general linguistic interest -- since that common to all of the tests is the relatively unusual linguistic material involved. In this study this communality was found to be involved in many of the tests of French achievement indicating its general importance for language achievement. One extremely interesting aspect of this element of linguistic interest was that it was also related to the intelligence sub-test concerned with inductive reasoning. Thus, this linguistic interest seems to depend considerably upon inductive reasoning ability. This is the only clear indication in our data of a link between intelligence and language learning aptitude.

In general, the results of this study then suggest that intelligence is virtually unrelated to French achievement or to recently developed measures of language aptitude. In addition, it is evident that it is possible to distinguish between at least four independent French skills in the early stages of language learning. This doesn't mean to say that achievement in one of these skills is completely unrelated to achievement in another. It would be impossible, for example, to think of how a student would be skilled in French oral reading without a knowledge of French vocabulary or grammar. It does mean, however, that despite the interrelations among these various achievements, it is possible to delineate basic components which appear to depend to some extent upon different aptitudes.

Although it seems clear that there is an aptitude or talent for second-language learning, it is equally possible that other factors play as important a role in the acquisition of a second language. Many teachers, for example, argue that other variables such as interest, motivation, or personality are equally important for achievement, and it is difficult to understand therefore why comparatively little research has been concerned with these aspects. The few studies which have been done (notably by Dunkel in 1948, Pollitzer 1953 and Cox in 1955) have obtained inconclusive results. One possible reason for the lack of interest in this area is possibly the inherent difficulty in conceptualizing and measuring those motivational and personality variables which would determine success in second-language learning. Thus, although it seems logical that motivation, for example, is an important variable in the learning of any skill, the antecedent variables leading to a high or low level of motivation may be many in number and exceedingly difficult to conceptualize. It would appear that some incidental findings by W.E. Lambert in his studies of bilingualism offered the first empirical evidence of a motivational syndrome of importance for second-language acquisition. In one study where he was concerned with measuring bilingual automaticity by means of speed of response to simple instructions in either French or English, he compared the reactions of three different groups of students differing in degree of experience with the French language. The groups included:

1. Undergraduate American students majoring in French
2. Graduates (post M.A. -- majoring in French)
3. Native European French-speaking students, -- with an average of seven years' residence in the U.S.

His major results on the reaction-time test indicated that 10 of the 14 students in the first group were English dominant (i.e. they responded significantly faster to English directions than French directions) and that four students were balanced (i.e. equally quick in English and French). Of the second group of students (American graduate students), seven were dominant English, six balanced and one dominant French. Of the native French group, 10 were balanced, while four were dominant in French. These findings then indicated that this test of automaticity was a useful one for differentiating among differing degrees of bilinguality.

The incidental finding which I mentioned earlier, however, concerned the one American graduate student who measured as dominant in French. Interviews of the students revealed that this individual was particularly oriented toward France, that he was dissatisfied with the U.S., that he reacted against anything which was non-European and "only read" French materials. He himself claimed that he had recently been to France, and was returning as soon as possible (apparently to stay). Although this is an extreme case, it did suggest that a strong motivation to acquire French (with resulting success) resulted from an extremely favorable orientation to France, and possible dissatisfaction with his own culture.

A similar case, which emphasizes the opposite reaction to that noted above, was cited by Eugene Nida. He described the case of a Mr. D., a missionary, who had extreme difficulty learning the language of the group with which he was going to be placed. Although he was highly motivated to become a missionary and consequently worked extremely hard at acquiring the language, and although he was extremely intelligent, and had good teachers, he nonetheless failed to acquire a useful level of second-language skill. Analysis of his personal history indicated that his parents had emigrated to the U.S., and that as a boy, Mr. D. had dissociated himself from the cultural background of his parents, and insisted on speaking English. To others, he denied knowing the parents' language. Nida suggests that because of his extreme identification with English, Mr. D. was eventually unable to overcome his intense emotional reaction to a "foreign" non-English language.

Although these two cases are extreme, there is the suggestion that attitudinal factors play a considerable role in one's ability or motivation to acquire a second language, since the acquisition of a new language involves more than just the acquisition of a new word for an old one!

The student seeking to acquire a second language must adopt various features of behaviour which characterize another linguistic and cultural group. The new words, grammatical rules, pronunciations and sounds, have a meaning over and above that which the teacher is trying to present. They are representations of another cultural community, and as such the student's attitudes toward that group, and towards outgroups in general will partly determine how easily and completely he will incorporate these verbal habits.

To some extent, it seems reasonable to assume that the role played by the student's attitudes in this language acquisition process will depend upon the general cultural context. In many European countries for example, bilingualism is the expected mode of behaviour. Children grow up expecting to be able to converse in more than one language and foreign languages are an integral part of the socialization process. On the North American continent, on the other hand, one language is for all practical purposes the only one needed, and many children generally come to accept English as the language (as opposed to a language). Foreign languages are often associated with minority groups of low socio-economic status, and the speaker of a foreign language is often looked upon with suspicion, hostility, or ridicule.

In a recent study, Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum studied the reactions of English-speaking university students to people speaking either English or French. Tape recordings of four bilingual individuals reading a standard passage, once in French and once in English, were played to a group of students. They were instructed to rate each individual that they heard on a number of personality and physical traits, and were told that although some of the individuals were speaking English, and others French, that this was only to make the task more interesting. The students were not told that the same speakers were in fact speaking once in English and once in French. The results of this study indicated that these students at least, tended to rate a speaker as shorter, less good looking, less intelligent, less dependable, less kind, less ambitious, and with less character when he was speaking in French than when the same person was speaking in English. Similar results were obtained more recently in a study we conducted with high school students in three American centers.

It is because of this general cultural ethnocentrism which appears characteristic of the North American continent that the student's attitudes toward the group whose language he is acquiring are seen as influencing his level of achievement. Students with favorable attitudes toward the group will be able to accept the linguistic representations of the group, and will consequently strive to acquire the language. Students with unfavorable attitudes on the other hand, will view the language with this negative connotation, and consequently will find it difficult to motivate themselves to work in acquiring the language.

Our linking of attitudes and motivation lead us to consider the students' objectives in language study. We were able to differentiate two main objectives, or orientations in language study. Students who claimed that learning French was valuable because it would enable them to get a better job, or because they would appear better educated, etc...were classified as instrumentally oriented since the prime emphasis seemed to be on the utilitarian value of the language. These students were contrasted with those who gave integrative orientations such as "learning French is valuable because I get to know more about the French way of life", or "I can meet more French-speaking people". Such reasons are classified as integrative since the chief interest seems to be an interest in the other language community, with a desire to become closer to it.

In the first study in which we attempted to determine the relevance of this type of theorizing to second-language acquisition, we investigated the interrelations of 13 variables concerned with language aptitude, intelligence, motivation, attitudes towards the French-Canadian community, and the orientation described above, and the relationship of these variables to teachers' ratings of the individual achievements of 75 Grade 11 English-speaking high school students' achievement in French.

The results clearly indicated that two components, or factors, were related to achievement in French. One of these components, as one would expect, was language aptitude, the other was what we described as an integrative motive. This motive, it should be noted, was of a particular type in that it characterized a strong degree of effort towards the acquisition of French because of a willingness, or desire, to be like valued members of the other language community.

These two components, or factors, were unrelated to each other which implies therefore that students with either high linguistic aptitude or a strong integrative motive will tend to be successful in second-language acquisition. However, those students who have the necessary language aptitude and who at the same time are integratively motivated in their language study will be even more successful.

It should be emphasized here that we are not speaking simply of the individual who works hard at learning the language. That is, motivation itself does not necessarily produce a high level of second-language achievement. It appears to be only in those cases where the motivational quality is linked with a favorable attitude toward the linguistic community, and an expressed interest in learning the language in order to understand more about the other linguistic group, and to meet more of its members, that success in learning the language is accomplished.

Since this study produced results which were relatively new, it was imperative that further research be conducted to check on the validity, and reproducibility of the results. In addition, the criterion that was used was the teacher's overall evaluation of each student's French achievement, and from the first study we had no knowledge of the possible differential effects of aptitude and the integrative motive on different linguistic skills. Thus, at the completion of that study it appeared reasonable to expect that language aptitude would be more related to some skills (such as vocabulary and grammar), whereas the integrative motivational characteristics may be more important for the acquisition of other skills, such as pronunciation accuracy, fluency in French speech, and possibly aural comprehension. That is, it was thought that success in school-taught second-language skills might be related to language aptitude because, like any other subject, the student with the necessary abilities can more easily comprehend the instruction in the time given. On the other hand, it was felt that the integrative motive might be related to language skills which develop more through actual usage of the language in intercourse with native speakers because students who are integratively motivated would probably tend to seek out such interaction with members of the other linguistic group.

Consequently, another study was developed which again was concerned with the differential effects of language aptitude, and the characteristics of the integrative motive, (that is favorable attitudes towards the French group, motivational intensity in studying French, and the integrative orientation) on achievement in French. In this study however, measures of achievement in specific French skills were obtained such as language teachers' evaluations of the student's reading fluency, pronunciation accuracy, and type of accent, objective measures of aural comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, associations in French, and bilingual automaticity. Subjects for this investigation were 83 Grade 10 English-speaking high-school students.

Again, the same two patterns, or components, emerged as the main findings. Two independent components, language aptitude and the main elements of the integrative motive, were related to indices of French achievement. In this analysis, however, it was clear that the measures of language aptitude were highly related to measures of grammar and aural comprehension, while measures of accent, vocabulary, and bilingual automaticity were more related to the integrative motive. Measures of pronunciation accuracy, and oral reading fluency, on the other hand, were approximately equally related to both components.

In understanding the significance of this study it is important to realize that these students had had an average of six years' prior training in French, and it is possible that these patterns reflect to some extent the emphasis which was placed on the various skills in the school situation. That is, grammar and aural comprehension appear to be two skills which were emphasized in these classes, consequently students with a high degree of language aptitude tend to profit from such training. On the other hand, bilingual automaticy, vocabulary and a French-Canadian accent, are skills which are not stressed in the classroom and consequently would be attained by those students who are motivated to make use of their language outside the classroom situation. Similarly, whereas pronunciation accuracy and reading fluency are specifically taught, they also appear to depend upon this integrative motive.

Since the component which seemed to be the organizing element of the motivational variables was the student's orientation, we were interested in discovering some of its important determining factors. The home environment appeared to be one aspect worthy of investigation, consequently interviews were arranged with the parents of these students to obtain information about the home environments. Analyzing the parents' responses to a standard interview produced findings which appear to suggest a fundamental derivative of the student's orientation.

In contrast to the students who professed an instrumental orientation, integratively-oriented students tended to come from homes where the parents also professed an integrative orientation, and where the parents had definite pro-French attitudes. (In short, the students were apparently reflecting the parents' attitudes in their choice of orientations.) Interestingly, however, there did not appear to be any relation between the student's orientation and the number of French friends the parents had, or the degree of French proficiency that the parents expressed. Parents of the integratively-oriented students did, however, think that their children had more French-speaking friends than did the parents of instrumentally-oriented students. Whether this was a statement of fact (i.e. that the integratively-oriented students did have more French-speaking friends) could not be ascertained from the data gathered. It is equally possibly that because of their own favorable attitudes towards the French-Canadian community, the parents of the integratively-oriented students were willing to ascribe a number of French friends to their children, while parents of the instrumentally-oriented students with their comparatively unfavorable attitudes, would not admit that their children associated with many French-Canadian children.

These relationships between the parents' attitudes and the student's orientations indicate therefore, that to some extent the degree of skill which the student attains in a second language will be dependent upon the attitudinal atmosphere in the home concerning the other linguistic group. Thus, it is possible that parents who have favorable attitudes towards the French community, and who feel that learning the language is valuable because it allows one to learn more about the group, and meet more of its members, actually encourage their children to study French, whereas the parents with the unfavorable attitudes and the instrumental orientation do not effect the same degree of encouragement.

This finding does, I believe, have some implications for experiments on teaching techniques, especially where courses are being introduced at an earlier grade. Generally, when a new course is introduced, it is often on a trial basis, and as such the parents of the students involved are asked if they will permit their children to take part. The parents who are willing to let their children take the new course are quite likely those who favor language instruction for integrative reasons and consequently their children will reflect these attitudes. Since this integrative orientation is important for success in language courses, the selection of students in this way tends to ensure that the course will be a success. Coupled with the fact that students are to some extent pre-selected on the basis of aptitude too, results may be better for these experimental programs than when the course is introduced as a part of the regular curriculum.

The two studies which I have just described were conducted in Montreal and consequently the extent to which such results can be generalized to other cultural areas may be questioned. We have had the opportunity of conducting similar studies in other areas -- specifically Louisiana, Maine and Connecticut. Generally, the results obtained substantiate the conclusion that both aptitude and motivation are important for the successful acquisition of a second language. However, it was evident from these later studies that an ethnocentric attitude (that is a generalized suspicion and hostility towards all outgroups) was more instrumental in preventing students from successfully acquiring the second language than was the case in Montreal.

Although it is clear that the student's favorable orientation towards the other linguistic group influences language acquisition, it is not clear that language acquisition promotes favorable attitudes. Studies of students engaged in intensive six-week French language courses failed to show any increase in favorable attitudes towards the French community as a result of this experience. On the other hand, these students did show a consistent increase in feelings of anomie -- a feeling of normlessness or not belonging in any cultural group. Since these students were all, at the beginning, relatively skilled in French, the implication is that with advanced language assimilation there develops a feeling of marginality -- of being neither truly North American nor truly French. As the students progressed to the point that they "thought" in French, it was noted that their feelings of anomie also increased. At the same time, they tried to find means of using English even though they had pledged to use only French for the six-week period. The pattern suggests that such students experience "anomie" when they concentrate on and commence to master a second language and, as a consequence, develop strategems to control or minimize such feelings.

This same type of marginality feeling seems to characterize even bilingual children. In a study of bilingual and French monolingual ten-year-old children in Montreal, data were gathered on the children's attitudes towards both the English and French communities. The results indicated that the bilingual children had more favorable attitudes toward the English group and less favorable attitudes to the French group than did the French monolingual children. Other data indicated that these bilingual children had identified themselves with both groups whereas the French monolingual children showed allegiances more to the French group. That is, the bilingual children gave evidence of feelings of marginality, whereas the monolingual children did not.

The research findings then would appear to have implications for language teaching technology. Firstly, it seems clear that there is such a thing as a language aptitude and more important, that this aptitude is relatively independent of those abilities which we subsume under the general heading of intelligence. This doesn't mean to say that if we choose only intelligent children we won't have a group who will tend to learn languages quickly. It does mean, however, that there are ways of selecting the most able students for language training which are more efficient and more accurate than when basing the choice on intelligence. Furthermore, the concept of a language aptitude doesn't suggest that some students can and some students cannot learn the language. It does suggest that given a certain amount of time for studying, and a certain adequacy of presentation of the material, some students will develop a higher level of achievement than others. Improving the adequacy of presentation of the language by improved techniques will raise the general level of achievement, but there will probably still be some children who will develop only a mediocre knowledge of the language.

There is at present considerable disagreement among psychologists as to whether aptitudes of the nature of language aptitude are learned or relatively fixed by heredity. Whatever the outcome of this argument, it seems clear that any given student's aptitude will be relatively fixed (either by learning or heredity) by the time he registers for a language class. On the other hand, his attitudes and motivation are generally malleable and amenable to remarkable changes -- particularly if the student is young. On this point there is considerable amount of research to indicate that the student, up to the age of about nine or 10, has not really incorporated the attitude which the adult community has towards various groups. As such, you can sway him one way or another by using propaganda methods. After the student reaches this age he tends to adopt the attitudinal characteristics of his immediate environment and at this time techniques of propaganda are less effective. There is considerable discussion about whether or not young children are better language learners than older children. Although, I have no data to substantiate such a claim, it is possible that the superiority of the younger child is dependent upon the fact that his attitudes are not working against him; that is, he doesn't have these particularly negative attitudes with which to fight with in the language acquisition process. Since his attitudes towards the other group, toward the potential value of the language, and his motivation appears to be as important for the successful acquisition of a second language as is his aptitude, it is possible that this area provides an avenue for improving individual learning. Techniques which encourage a favorable approach to the other linguistic group, which develop in the student a strong desire to learn the language in order to associate with members of that group, will capitalize on the motivational qualities, and encourage rapid assimilation of the useful aspects of language for the purposes of communication. Techniques which allow only for the rote memorization of dry linguistic material would seem to allow for the development of a technical skill in the language only to the extent that the student has the necessary aptitude and a lack of any extreme anti-out-group attitudes.

. . . . . .

References

1. Carroll, J.B., A factor analysis of two foreign language aptitude batteries. J.gen.Psychol. 1958, 59, 3-19.

2. Carroll, J.B., and Sapon, S.M., Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT). Psychological Corporation, New York, 1959.

3. Cox, F.N., the prediction of success and failure in learning foreign languages. Australian J.Psychol., 1955, 7, 56-65.

4. Dunkel, H.B., Second-language learning. Boston: Ginn, 1948.

5. Gardner, R.C., Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, McGill University, 1960.

6. Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E., Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. Canad. J.Psychol., 1959, 13, 266-272.

7. Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E., Language aptitude, intelligence, and second-language achievement. Unpublished paper, 1961.

8. Henmon, V.A.C., Prognosis tests in the modern foreign languages. Publication of the American and Canadian committees on modern foreign languages. 1929, 14, 3-31.

9. Lambert, W.E., Measurement of the linguistic dominance of bilinguals. J. abnorm. soc.Psychol., 1955, 50, 197-200.

10. Lambert, W.E., Gardner, R.C., Barik, H.C., and Tunstall, K., Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of a second language. J.abnorm.soc.Psychol., 1962, in press.

97-98

11. Lambert, W.E., Gardner, R.C., Olton, R. and Tunstall, K. A study of the roles of attitudes and motivation in second-language learning. McGill University, (Mimeo, 1960).

12. Nida, E.A., Motivation in second-language learning. Language learning., 1956-1957, 7, 11-16.

13. Peal, Elizabeth, The effects of bilingualism on intelligence. Unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, 1961.

14. Pollitzer, R.L., Student motivation and interest in elementary language courses. Language learning. 1953-1954, 5, 15-21.

15. Wittenborn, J.R., and Larsen, R.P., A factorial study of achievement in college German. J.educ.Psychol., 1944, 35, 39-49.

QUESTIONS -- and ANSWERS by Dr. Gardner

Q: In which part of Montreal were the attitudes of children tested?

Dr. Gardner: We were careful to select schools from the west end where we thought at least the attitudes were somewhat less favorable towards the French, from the centre of the city and also from the east end where we thought the attitudes would be more favorable towards the French. If anything, we tended to find the opposite of these attitudes in the east end. We found them less favorable than the attitudes in the west.

Q: Has there been any study of attitudes affected by teaching?

Dr. Gardner: We have not done these studies. There was one done in England where they did compare attitudes towards the French -- before and after one year's French instruction -- and there was no significant change. In our studies on the intensive programs we again didn't get any change in attitudes towards the French-speaking community. From a number of people I have talked to, particularly the ones who do not like French, I sometimes get the impression that their hostility towards the French group may have originated from the classroom situation. It is interesting to note what happened when one Montreal school tried to introduce French to Grade three students. The teacher was brought over from France to do this particular job. She told us that the biggest difficulty she had during the first few months was to win over her students' affections. They tended to think she was funny or different or something. She spent most of the time not teaching the language but just trying to get the children, as she put it, to love her. We saw the effect of this approximately seven months after it was started and the people with me were astounded at the level that these Grade three children had developed under this particular technique. She wasn't using any one method except this tender loving care. Her students, I think it is fairly safe to say, were much more skilled in French in Grade three than roughly 60 percent of the Grade 10 and Grade 11 students whom we were testing in Montreal.

Q: Has any research been done to teach two languages simultaneously, to an Italian boy, for example?

Dr. Gardner: I know Dr. Lambert has attempted to teach two languages simultaneously in a laboratory situation, that is, he made up two artificial languages, neither of which is English, and tried to teach each of them simultaneously. So far he has been comparing the simultaneous versus the successive aspects, that is, the effects of learning one and then learning the other. He has two studies out. The first one suggested that the successive language learning process was the best, that is, you should learn one before you learn the other. On the second study it came out that the simultaneous learning of these two languages produced better knowledge of the language and more rapid learning than the successive, so the results on this aspect are controversial. Now, this is where they are learning two new languages at the same time. It is not really analogous to the real life situation. Most of this is concerned with vocabulary. It seems to me that over in Europe we should be able to get data on this but I haven't seen anything from them.

APPLIED

LINGUISTICS

-- and What It Means To Language Teachers

by
Professor Jean-Paul Vinay
Director
Department of Linguistics
University of Montreal

Applied linguistics is in the air. Books are written about it and courses in applied linguistics are offered in many places, including Montreal. Expensive labs are bought in the hope of appeasing this new urge and I think that you may say now that it pays the institution to place the word linguistics somewhere in the calendar. Conferences, such as this, are also held to discuss ways and means of applying linguistics.

First, a definition. What is applied linguistics? I found an answer in Pollitzer's book, "Teaching French -- an Introduction to Applied Linguistics," published by Ginn and Company. In the preface, he says there is or should be, a very intimate relationship between linguistics, the scientific study of languages, and language teaching. I think we all agree on this that there should be an intimate relationship. I don't know that there is.

Perhaps some of the confusion concerning applied linguistics is due to the fact that so far little work has been done in showing the application of linguistics to the teaching of any one particular language. So, it would seem from this second remark that it is the linguists' fault if applied linguistics is not better known. And, he comes to a definition which will be our starting point. Applied linguistics is that part of linguistic science which has direct bearing on the planning and presentation of teaching material. Well, it is a good definition.

I have my own definition which we can start from. Applied linguistics means, to my point of view (1) that you know something about linguistics and (2) that you know how to apply it.

Point number one -- "you know something about linguistics" -- is of course the basic point and I think it would answer the second half of this title, "What It Means to a Language Teacher". Linguistics nowadays is sufficiently publicized to make it unthinkable for any teacher not to know something about it if he or she so wishes. There are, for instance, linguistic institutes or linguistic summer schools practically everywhere in the United States, and in several universities of Canada, one in the west and one in the east at least. There are some in Europe, in the U.K., in France, in Germany. There is one, for instance, in Montreal, and in the one we hold in Montreal we offer a choice, -- that is, not only during the summer but also during the regular course -- a choice between two courses. One, which we might call Les Lettres, or letters, and the other one, La Linguistique, linguistics. Students in the linguistics section are certainly increasingly numerous. I have had occasion to speak this year to several meetings and often, as it is the case today, I have seen in the audience some well-known faces of students who have been with us or had been with us for two or three years, and are now pushing on with the good work in some other places. Journals, -- such as the greatest of all, the Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association -- books and teaching aids of all sorts are now very numerous. Libraries are beginning to take notice of linguistics which for a long time was hidden somewhere between history and geology and now is given a special niche all to itself, which is very nice. So that it is difficult to be ignorant about linguistics. That's a good sign. And yet, all this is not extremely new. We may perhaps spend a few minutes thinking about the novelty of it. What is new, actually, is the fact that people sit up and take notice about linguistics, but linguistics has been going on steadily for 60 or 70 years or more.

A recent series of books on language linguistics makes the point that the theory at the back of all of these books was implicit in every practical grammar written for a hundred years, that it wasn't explicit, and it is this explicitness of the approach which is the novelty. So, to people who are slightly anxious when they see new things, you may say, "Well, this is not very new. What is new is that you know about it."

It may be a good thing to spend time five minutes on one instance of a success and a failure of applied linguistics in the past. If we can say why it failed, perhaps we can avoid another failure now. For instance, let's take the period of 1880 to 1914. If you look at reviews and books of this period, you realize that there was a turn of theory and feeling, a change about how one should teach languages. This was, of course, the time when people thought for the first time that languages should be spoken and not written. To a lot of teachers this was not new. Also, that you should teach through the direct method rather than through translation. One book published in 1880 argued that it was time to change completely our methods of teaching languages and the book had such a success that language schools sprang up practically everywhere, in Germany, in the Scandinavian countries, in France, and England. And just at that time linguists had found something else. They had found that you can't use letters, but letters are usually a way of hiding the spoken language. And they came in with the theory that phonetics, as they called it then, would be the thing to teach. They published a good many things; they published books on phonetics of all modern languages and a good many others, and even some dead languages. They invented an alphabet, the national phonetic alphabet, 1882; they had an international association which still exists; they had exams; they had conventions such as this; and by the turn of the century everybody knew about phonetics and a good many people were beginning to use phonetics in the classroom. And yet today it is very hard to find schools where phonetics is used at all. One thing which was gained was the fact that phonetic transcription was usually given in dictionaries and some cases in textbooks, especially for difficult languages like English, for instance, or French. It was very useful. I don't think it was used very much for German, and it wasn't used at all for Spanish. Russian wasn't in the picture then.

We may ask ourselves, why did it fail? It failed, I think, on two counts. The first count -- which is, I think, the teacher's fault -- was that teachers were not prepared for it. It meant to them that they had to speak the language and speak it well, and understand the language also if they wanted to teach through phonetics. It also meant, and I've seen it in my capacity as inspector of schools, that if a good teacher teaches the first grade of, shall we say, English, and a moderately good or poor teacher inherits that grade in Grade two and makes mistakes, the class will tell him that he has made a mistake and realize that mistake more clearly because they have the means through phonetics, of knowing these mistakes and, of course, this is not very popular among teachers. In other words, phonetics made it more difficult to teach a language by people who were not trained. They were trained for the written language but not for the spoken one.

I have seen in the old textbooks, some references to phonetics, usually five or six words on the right-hand page or left-hand page in phonetics. No one ever used it. And, even in dictionaries no one ever paid any attention to it. In some countries like France, for instance, printers insistently refused to make or buy the fonts necessary for the printing of letters and when you printed in such a way that you can't read it, well it's not very extraordinary that no one should pay any notice to it. So my point is that phonetics failed through the teacher's own fault or possibly through the teachers of the teachers -- in universities and specialized schools.

The second reason why it failed is probably more interesting. It failed through lack of integration. That is to say, the findings of the level of sound were not integrated with any other level. You didn't know what to do once you had examined the level of the spoken language. Where were you going to go from there? Were you going to apply that to the teaching of morphology, for instance, and to the teaching of syntax? There was no way of doing that. All you could do was have a text which was longer and longer and longer and you had a whole book at the end but you never went from one level to another. So it died out, apparently.

But some people think that good seeds had been planted and tended, and finally a new school came up. This school was the Prague School in 1925. The Prague School did quite a different thing this time. They said 'for 30 years phonetics has been a science and we know all what we want to know about it, or practically all. But we have no theory, we have no philosophy behind it.' So, they wanted to try and find what were the units with which you should operate. They invented the word phonemics and they put it on the market in 1925. Immediately half of the teachers were against it. When I say half, I should say three-quarters of the teachers were against it, but then there are people who are against anything new. The remainder split into various schools. But the thing went on very carefully and in a nutshell, the contrast method was born.

I want you to know something about contrast. I think through contrast, and any method based on contrast, you can proceed from one level to another. In 1940, the war came and the people of the Prague School immigrated to Sweden and then to the United States. In the meantime, a good many Americans had been taught about the method and this explains why in 1940 you have the sudden new method of teaching languages -- born through the necessity of the war and built on the Prague School of teaching. It took 30 years to evolve the first one, phonetics. It took about 30 years to evolve the second one, phonemics. The difference between the two is that you have a theory in phonemics which you can apply to any other level. That is to say, if it works for science it will work also for words, it will work for patterns, and it will even work for behaviour patterns.

So you may say that applied linguistics is what you can apply from the linguistic theory to the teaching of languages. I think it is very true if you look, for instance, at the table of contents of Mr. Pollitzer's book, "Teaching French -- an Introduction to Applied Linguistics," you'll get my point. Phonemics, that is the first chapter, has 38 pages. Morphology has 20. Syntax has 20. The lexicon has nine and culture and behaviour, two. The decreasing numbers simply mean that we know a lot about the first level, a little less about the second and even less about the third and the fourth. So, when it comes to applying that you find a wealth of material for the first level, possibly on the second also, very little on the third, and practically none at all on the fourth. That's how it is. You see you don't apply a science which hasn't found itself yet. But you can certainly apply the first level, which is I think, more or less now explored.

I think it is worth delving for a moment in the past to see why one aspect of applied linguistics failed. I would like to say that there is one prerequisite for the application of linguistics which is probably true of any other science and any other application but perhaps more so in the case of linguistics. You have to be enthusiastic about it. If you don't like it, it will fail and very likely it failed in 1914 because people didn't like it and didn't know it and possibly the curious shape of phonetic symbols was enough to put people in such a mood that they didn't want to teach it.

After this very brief introduction, what then are the main contributions of linguistics which can be applied? There are two or three articles that exist which can help us here. One of them is Prof. Moulton's article in PMLA, May 1961. Moulton is an excellent linguist. A second document we have produced is the preface of Pollitzer's book. So if you put together Moulton's and Pollitzer's and my own feeling, you get four points. They are important.

(1) Before going any further you have to realize that language is a structure. Language is not a jumble of things that you can add to at will. It is a structure, and as of all structures, all the elements of that structure are inter-related. I often give an example of what I mean by structure. If you go to Gaspe, after the lobster you walk on the beach and you find some excellent and very beautiful stones. You pick up the first one, put a label on it and the date, and start a collection. And then you pick up another one and it obviously is also of the same type but it has a different shape. Then you pick up a third which is obviously of the same type but it's bigger and heavier and so on. And after a while you get a truck and fill the truck with all sorts of stones and they are all different. That way you have a nice collection of stones. Yet you feel that they are all the same. Well, they are the same because they have the same structure and so someone comes along and says, "This is stupid. All you need is to have one stone, because that one will answer all the requisite of that particular structure and you can throw all the others away because they are all exactly the same." They are all a variation of one structure so you send the truck home and you only bring one stone. And that one stone is different from all other stones of different structures. Obviously it is identical with any stone of that particular structure, and any variation in size and shape will only be non-relevant. My first point is language is a structure, so you must know about this. And the analysis of that structure, which is precisely what linguistics does, is aiming at the simplest possible description. People insist on this; I think this is important. If you have a very complicated structure and if your description of it is even more complicated, it's better to drop it altogether. If you can simplify it, if your description is better than your neighbor's because it's simpler, then you have advanced one step.

(2) Spoken language is the primary factor. It should be studied first because the spoken word comes first. And then, of course,

it should be integrated in the whole of the language which is composed of the spoken word, the written word, and the movements, the expressions of the face, all the social behaviour that goes with it. I have to learn to make new gestures when I speak a new language. If not then I give the impression that I do not know the language very well. I was taught by my professor to stammer lightly in English to give the impression that I know English well because stammering in English is a form of good behaviour and if you learn to speak French there are gestures and things that you must learn that come with the language also and give a very good impression of your knowledge of that language. If you learn German you can't whisper. If you learn Spanish you have to talk at a very close quarter. And you know why Americans don't like Mexicans, for instance, because a Mexican has to be very near to talk and an American has to be at a very certain distance to listen. The result is that the Mexican always draws forward and the American always backward.

Spoken form, therefore, is only one factor. I think it comes before the others.

(3) Contrast procedures seem to be at the bottom of all this new theory and by contrast I mean that you have two things in the structure which are different but this difference has relevancy, and this is what you should teach. For example, if you write the word sing with an "s" you get certain forms. If you write it without an "s" you get another set of forms. You realize that the first thing you can prove is that this "s" is pertinent. You can prove that this "s" is a different one than the one you had in linguistics. You can also prove that the "s" plays a different role if you say, "he sings" and "he sing". You get a different role or different tense. But all these, of course, are relevant, and therefore you can establish contrast. Whereas some things are not relevant at all. For instance, you can write an "r" in two different ways but it doesn't matter, it is still an "r". Some variants have relevancy, such as: the way 1 and 7 are written in Europe and in the States. We write one as you write seven. The result is if you live at 101 of some street in some countries you get 707 instead and so this happens to be something relevant but not in the same language between two languages. The bar across will help us to dispell any case of confusion. The contrast is the basic procedure to discover the units of the language. You can discover, for instance, that some units are perfectly free, and as a rule with the contrast they are free as with the word petite and petit in French. You notice that petite ends with a vowel and petit ends with a "t", and you can pin on this one difference, on this one contrast, the difference between masculine and feminine. Sometimes the contrasts disappear and this is what we call neutralization. It is a very sad story. It always happens in all languages and it very often can be dispelled by a very sensitive ear. For

instance, if I say, six petite trous or six petites roues you all noticed, of course, that they are two different utterances, but the difference is so small that it really becomes a point whether we should teach it or should build anything on this contrast? It is such a small contrast but it exists, I think. One means six little holes and one means six little wheels.

You have the same thing in English: "See them eat," and "See the meat." Of course there is the favorite example -- the nude eel which is different from the New Deal.

Pollitzer says this contrast can be carried and this is new. Not only in the field of the description itself, but also in the field of teaching. Now the novelty, and this point has been well made through this very good little journal called "Language Teaching" from Michigan, is that you should contrast not only within the language but between the language of your students and the language which they are learning. In other words, contrast between the two languages. This is called contrastive linguistics and I think it is very important. If you teach a language like French with a gender to people who don't have the gender you should realize that this is going to make difficulties. If you teach a language like French with imperfect to people with a language like English without imperfect this is going to make difficulties and I mark papers from people making these mistakes who are doing Ph.D. work. You see, this is very difficult. In the same way,"I have bought" and "I bought". In English it is very difficult for French speakers because we don't know what you mean by "I have bought" as opposed to "I bought". It's a contrast but we don't realize it, we don't know how to do it properly. Do you notice how many times we err on this particular point? So my third point is contrast, either within the language or between two languages.

(4) This method of analysis is good not only for a level like phonemics, sounds, but for more important levels like words or grammar faults. It is also interesting when you have got to analyse behaviour. This, I think, is also a very new sort of thing. I noticed, for instance, that linguists are worming their way into fields in which a lot of you don't like to see them. For instance, literary criticism. You can criticize a text by applying contrasted methods and it comes out as very sound criticism of style, for instance, and the inner stylistics and the comparative stylistics are probably a spearhead, of this tendency. You can also analyse the behaviour of writers. To give you one example, if you translate a book about something happening in France and in that story people are shaking hands and you translate that as "people shaking hands", you give a different impression to the English reader because in England or in this country you don't shake hands very often. This is one of the things we have to learn and when I taught in an English school I shook hands with everybody there on the

> first day. The result is that I was shunned by the whole staff for a week or so. So I never shook hands at all and my popularity went up. But on the first of January I should have shaken hands and I didn't. So they said, "Why don't we shake hands today? This is the day." So there are obviously things you have to do and therefore, this is a contrast. It is a linguistic contrast. It has meaning, you see. I also noticed one thing which I didn't know about. I was struck by nice British tweeds and, after a year or two of saving, finally I bought a nice suit, a beautiful grey, and then I went to look for a tie that would match that particular grey. I went to Regent Street and finally I found a beautiful tie. It was red. I put on the red tie and my grey suit and people said, "Oh, how long have you been a Socialist?" So I learned that a red tie in these circles had a meaning. I didn't know that. Also, of course, if you go to buy ties you can buy any amount of ties that you are not allowed to wear because they have a meaning, and you don't know what, of course. It comes to you as a shock, and it can be analysed, Therefore, this is the last of the four points.

I think that covers more or less the first chapter of this talk. The second one, is that linguistics have to be applied and therefore all this knowledge should now be applied in the classroom. The first thing we notice is linguistics, as a rule, starts from the spoken word. Now this is at once very important and a very large headache. Why? First of all you realize that if you spell a language which you don't pronounce, you can probably read texts from all over the world. You don't know if this particular writer has a dialect at all. But once you let him speak even a few words you know exactly what he is like. And so, if you have a course which has been done for you by a reasonably good speaker you have no problem. Therefore, the matter of dialect should come in. Also -- this is very important, I think -- the fact that you have two different grammars, and in French they are very different indeed. Textbooks give you the rules for the written grammar but none for the spoken one. I had a little Gallup poll with some teachers who come up to the University of Montreal and know something about linguistics. How do you ask a question in French? They all said by reversing word order. But this is the written form. So I said well, think again. And they came up with Est-ce-que vous voulez? Est-ce-que vous fumez? I said, "That's beautiful, but that's not what I would say, so think again." They couldn't think any more so I told them, "Well, there is a third form, 'Vous fumez?'" which is only the present tense and which is apparently what we say. I didn't realize until we had a long string of recordings on tape and we found out that we never use anything else. Vous comprennez? Vous voulez? Vous lisez? But never anything else. So much so that this new course from St. Cloud, Les Voix Images de France, has developed a course in which you don't have any other form for questions. I dare say the second part of it will have this type of question but the first one hasn't and of course when you do that before the class, the class is rather surprised. They don't expect it. So the big problem is the difference between not only the spoken and the written but also the fact that the rules are different.

Certain very important things may be quoted in this respect. For instance, what are the two different shapes of the word one or un? Usually you have two forms, u - n, un, or u - n - e, une. But in the spoken language you have three forms. You have un, you have une and you have un, (the nasal plus an n), un enfant. So you have on the one hand, a language with two contrasts and a language with three contrasts and you must know about that. Just as in English you have also three, I found out. You have a, a boy, you have an, an elephant, and you have A, (A as in may), A boy, which is used by teachers mostly and is now used by politicians also. There is a difference between je chante in phonetics and je chante in the written form. In the written form you have contrast between first person and second person; you have contrast between third person singular and third person plural. If you speak it these contrasts disappear. Je chante, tu chantes, il chante, ils chantent. The contrast between singular and plural which seems so important has completely gone.

The other day I went to a shop to buy a salami, and the man, who spoke French fairly well, wanted to show off, and said, "Voulez-vous celui?" So I waited. Apparently I said yes because I needed the salami. I then realized the word "celui" in French is never used like this. I never thought about it so I rushed home, paid the taxi, went to my room, opened the grammar, and I looked up celui and I found that celui is never used alone. You say "celui ci, celui la, celui de, celui que." But you never say celui. But now you can say, "Would you like this, would you like that," which is perfectly good English but rotten French.

The contrast can be carried very far between spoken and written language and, as I say, the terrible thing is that we don't have textbooks. I'll just throw in this idea -- if you go the whole hog you should do a first-year French or a first year English, purely on the spoken level, and possibly two years because, after all, when we learn our language we don't write and only then should we begin to introduce written rules. The trouble is we don't have textbooks for that. You may say that we don't need a textbook. But if that is the case you must be a very good teacher because it takes a long time to accumulate all that science and sometimes you don't have time for that. So I would suggest that this is probably the most needed sort of thing, a textbook or a method for the spoken language which is really spoken. Not half-heartedly so. And I don't know that it is very wise to introduce two standards at one time. I'm not sure. I did that and of course the main difficulty in France at the time when I tried was exams. As you know, we believe in only doing one thing at a time, so after a year of teaching English through purely oral methods and phonetic script they had to sit for an exam. Now this exam, of course, was on the written standards in the old days. If they had been allowed to speak surely they would have passed with flying colors, except possibly that the examiner might not have known enough English to realize that they were really good speakers of English.

If you apply linguistics you will feel that linguistics will help you in three ways and these are the basic principles I find, of this science. (a) You have a certain number of units. These units, of course, could be on the spoken level, they could be on the word level, they could be on any level you wish. (b) These units are in a certain order. You say "je le sais", you don't say "je sais le" or "le je sais". If you know that, this is already half the truth. Your knowledge of the language is certainly very sound, but it's not enough. (c) These units should be correlated with concepts and this correlation can be done through texts or through dictionaries. And this again is not enough. It must be these concepts which must be replaced in the situation or the context where they normally occur. If you learn out of a situation or out of a context you are bound to make mistakes. On the other hand, if you know the situation it becomes quite clear. A man whispers into my ear the word "saignant" which means bleeding. Then I ask the student, "Where am I?" Obviously in a restaurant and this is the garcon saying "seigneur". In England if someone whispers in my ear "clear" or "thick", it's not any relation to my mind, it's the soup. This is the situation again, and you must learn it, otherwise it doesn't make sense. Like the Hindu gentleman going to England for the first time, seeing an English lady and saying, "How do you do sir or madam, as the case may be?" Well, you've got to learn the situation.

Let me sum up: these are the seven lamps of linguistics.

Point number one: The teacher should know the theory at the back of languages. That is your duty, not the duty of the pupil. Teachers should know theory; teachers should know the structure. I think it makes sense.

Second point: If you teach a second language you should know both structures, the one that you are teaching in and the one that you are actually teaching so that you can contrast them. If you teach a second language you should know both structures.

Point three: The audio-visual excercises come first and the active lingual motor exercises come next.

Point four: Linguistic theory is not for school consumption. It's not good for the classroom and it's not meant to be taught. Linguistic theory as I see it is for the teacher, although when you get very advanced pupils you can get them very interested about linguistics but not at first.

Point five: Textbook writers should know about linguistics because we depend so much on textbooks and by that I also include tapes and records. If you believe that, you should realize that there should be two types of textbooks. Those which teach the language to people who speak and those which teach the language to people who don't speak it in second language classes. They are different, obviously.

Point six: All this pre-supposes what is usually called "hardware". This "hardware" is of no use whatever to you if you don't know how to use it and in order to use it go back to point (1) -- you must know the theory at the back of it.

Point seven: Language is not an end in itself, except for linguistics, of course. It really opens up into the realm of life and literature. That's very nice because then instead of having an opposition between teachers of letters and teachers of linguistics you really have a succession of two levels, one leading into the other and I think that makes for the peace and happiness of the school.

QUESTIONS -- and ANSWERS by Professor Vinay

Q: How important are phonetics to an English child learning a second language?

Prof. Vinay: I think you have answered that question by saying that you get the child to speak the language before you teach him to read. That's exactly what you do, therefore you teach by phonetics -- only you don't know that it is phonetics -- without realizing it. I think there are two points here. Either you are teaching phonetics, and may be very good at it, and not be able to say a word in a foreign language, or you don't, but you use phonetics and phonemics for teaching that language. I think I made the point that linguistics is not meant for consumption in the school, and therefore I think no linguistic theory should be taught as such at this very, very early level. But certainly if you are going to devise any exercise at all, then if you don't know the structure of the language, what you can do is to know phonetics, and even more, phonemics, which is, as you know, structural phonetics. That is the difference between the two, phonetics is a description and phonemics is the arrangement of that description into a structure. You must know that structure and I think I made the point that you must know the two structures, one of the English student and one of the French language, if this boy is going to learn. Now, I think you have to know a good deal of phonemics as you begin to teach a language. You have to know that in order to devise exercises to build up contrasts. You would be surprised, for instance, how difficult it is to teach a French class the contrast between i and e in English. I have had students who go on for years and years saying, "I feel feet." When they get the contrast, they usually get the wrong one.

Q: Many of the contrasts which exist tend to disappear the more rapidly a language is spoken. Yet when you instruct don't you have to be perfectly clear?

Prof. Vinay: I have some strong feelings about this. I think that we should never teach them anything than the normal rate of speech and therefore I would be against, I think, teaching them things like "See them eat." They would never be confronted with that except in your particular class. So I would be very much against tapes that go very slowly, or tapes that, by going slowly, distort reality to such an extent that it isn't French or it isn't English any more. You know, of course, the famous gadget called a speech stretcher. You speak at a normal rate and it comes out at half the rate. You find extraordinary things in it, and this is the contrary of what you said just now. It is not merely slow speech, but slowed rapid speech, that you get through the speech stretcher.

Q: Can we be sure different linguists are using the same "terms" (which are really technical terms) when describing the same things?

Prof. Vinay: This is a good question and also it is a very large headache. I find that in very many books you have different terms to mean exactly the same thing or the same word meaning different things. The tendency, I think, is to rationalize this slightly but even then I am sure at least two or three linguistic schools in America have different words meaning the same thing or different meanings for one word. I don't think you can help that, at any rate, at this stage. Possibly a recommendation of this assembly should be that this terminology should be unified. But don't forget, you may teach without using any of these words. I don't think these words are necessary for a good teacher. In a classroom, you don't have to know what juncture is, or that juncture is very important. You may simply call it something else or you may possibly make a drawing. Stress can be used with a little pencil mark, without calling it stress. If you have two stresses, you can have two different pencil marks without calling it primary or secondary stress.

Q: Should the author of a textbook write a book without having a thorough knowledge of the first language of the class?

Prof. Vinay: I think you have to have a very good knowledge of the language of your class before writing anything at all.

Q: Is it helpful for you to know the mistakes a student makes before he makes them? Do you have to know German to teach German, so long as you know the mistakes they are going to make? Isn't it in the drill that the "contrast" knowledge of the textbook writer should be important?

Prof. Vinay: I would say that the textbook writer should be aware of that because he has to build his exercises on some of these contrasts. The teacher may not have to know it although it probably helps if he does. Take the case of French speakers learning English. I know they are going to make some normal mistakes. They always do, so these drills, therefore, should also be done with a view to avoiding these. "The Jack's book" -- and you have heard people saying it -- is a French pattern, "Le livre du Jacques." "The book of Jack" is all right but "The Jack's book" is certainly something very difficult to avoid in French speakers. You can probably avoid this by drilling.

Q: What do you do in multi-lingual classes?

Prof. Vinay: You break them into smaller classes that are more bilingual.

Q: What sort of drill should you give?

Prof. Vinay: It seems to me that they must all do the same drills eventually because the drills obviously correspond to the language, but they may approach them in various groups. I noticed in last year's upper school we had a very large group of Spanish speakers. They were thrown in with a rather large group of English speakers and we simply had to separate them into two groups because, although most of the drills that we gave them were obviously to inspire them in French, their difficulty in regard to their approach was quite different.

Prof. Mackey: The problem is analogous to that of programmed learning. You have people who have to do exercises. You have the branching school and the step-by-step school. I think the confusion arises in the difference between learning a subject by cognition and learning a skill (in which case you can't have too much repetition). If you have drills programmed for the language as a whole you may have a lot of sheer repetition, which forms a habit. When you get to a point where there are difficulties then the learning value becomes greater.

Prof. Vinay: I find also, just to end this argument, that if you write a book about the teaching of French to the Indo-Chinese for instance, and one about the teaching of French to Indian speakers, you are also introducing the idea of differences of culture. And the "thought" behind that culture, I think, is very important. I notice that very often, when English-speaking people write French and when you really come to analyse it, you realize they were thinking in English all the time as far as culture goes, and that their present views are not at all expressed in French.

I took lessons in Norwegian when I was in London and I was the only French speaker in my class. I noticed that the others simply lapped it up. They knew practically all the structures of English which applied to Norwegian. There were some German speakers in the class who were far ahead of us, because it happens that Norwegian words are even more similar in many ways to German words. Also, they had this feeling for, shall we say, "dramatic culture," which I didn't have. I had to learn that. I think I would have done better if I had been in a different group.

Q: Is there agreement about the units of learning? E.g. Take the inflexion in verbs. How would linguistics apply to verb endings?

Prof. Vinay: I don't think there is complete agreement so that both answers would be the same: the terminology may be different and the approach may be different, but they would both correspond to reality. You can very often describe reality in a different way. You can say that you know this bottle is half-empty or half-full and therefore, you can describe and you can build your verb technique from the infinitive, if you wish, although this seems rather old-fashioned now. You can build it from the imperfect, which seems to be very much in fashion.

I think you probably are thinking of the difficulty which exists in the field of English and doesn't seem to exist so much in the field of French. In the field of English, you must admit, there are differences in American English, British English or Canadian English. None of our European books can be used in teaching English in Canada because they don't describe the same type of English. This is not true of French, where the international standard is acceptable pretty much everywhere and where regional forms can be taught from the international standard.

Q: We have been thinking in terms of perfection. I am wondering how the philosophy of this approach affects the teaching of a second language? Are we discouraging students? Should we emphasize perfection?

Prof. Vinay: I am sure this question, to which I have a few answers, may be answered by many people from the floor. Would anybody like to answer that?

Clifford Andrews: My own view is that you should make a distinction between teaching contrasts and teaching perfection. I think the goal of teaching a language is to teach contrasts and meaning.

C.T. Teakle: We have been trying for years to get perfection. I think it is imperative to let the children talk and correct only the major mistakes.

Douglas V. Parker: One of the problems in incorrect usage is the failure of the teacher to help the children to "hear" the differences.

Prof. Vinay: My own view is that you should make a distinction between teaching correct contrast and teaching perfection. I think the goal of teaching a language is to do the correct contrast and to be able to understand the meaning correctly rather than imitate. There is a school of thought in France which says that we should make that contrast even though they are not perfect. That probably is the distinction between phonetics and phonemics. Phonetics is perfection of each unit and phonemics is perfection of a contrast between two units even though they may not be perfect.

I can tell you that one of my daughters is learning English and after two or three years she told me she could not tell the difference when the teacher said "he can" and "he can't" and "he can do it" and "he can't do it" where the 't' of "can't" and the 'd' of "do" run together.

I would be tempted to say that from all the remarks I have heard today that perfection is not, at any rate in a classroom, to be achieved at the level of the phonetic unit but on the level of phonemics, that is to say, of the contrast, and this goes for the whole of the language. If you, for instance, make a mistake in gender, this is a very bad mistake because it changes the whole meaning of your message. But should you pronounce that message with a pronounced French or English accent then it's alright, it doesn't seem to make any difference to me. I gave a speech one day and the gentleman who thanked me obviously wanted to be very polite. I had used the word "un moule", which is a pattern, and he wanted to tell me that I should be a pattern to all teachers. Unfortunately he called me "une moule" which is an idiot.

Linguistics is of use because it teaches you contrast and therefore, at this level what you should do is to teach contrast.

To add to a remark Prof. Mackey made a few moments ago -- to me, the use of "the" in English is probably one of the most difficult things and the use of "le" in French also. Why? Simply because both languages don't use these words, which we tend to look on as being exactly similar, in the same way at all. You could write a whole book on 'le' in French or about 'the' in English and if you write that book you would have to write precisely the opposite very often. I think you should be very careful about the patterns in which 'the' occurs or about 'le' because you know beforehand that the class is going to mix up these two things.

Q: What should be taught first?

Prof. Vinay: What is essential to mutual comprehension.

Mr. Barnes: Talking of contrast, it is an absolute delight to see for the first time a pupil's awareness of the contrast between his or her spoken French and that of the model on tape.

Prof. Mackey: But what model are you going to use? The teacher, or somebody else on tape?

Prof. Vinay: The teacher is responsible for the choice of the model. Therefore he should be able to evaluate his own accent.

We have talked all the time about the level of sounds but I wouldn't like you going away thinking that structural linguistics has only got to do with sounds. I think it has some new things to say. So please do not think that descriptive linguistics has only to do with phonetics or phonemics. I'm struck everyday by very simple things like the use of "cher monsieur" by English speakers. It so happens that "cher monsieur" does not mean "Dear Sir." It is quite different. My English friends think there is a way of talking to customers and if your garage man at the pump says "my friend" you know he likes you. If he said "mon ami" in French, however, he becomes offensive because "mon ami" distinguishes someone you don't like when you begin to tell him off. Well, this is contrast with a vengence -- but not on the same level!

The Chairman

I think the dissipation of your earlier worry as to whether there might be sufficient discussion on the points that you had raised is more thanks than I could give you. I would be remiss in my duty as the chairman of this group, however, if I didn't say to you that although as you pointed out, linguistics is not a new science, if I may call it that, the application of linguistics for language teaching in classrooms in Canada is not yet common. As you know, this is a national gathering of people who were carefully selected from all across the country from different levels of education and different educational agencies, precisely because they could, if they would, when they went home, have an effect in classroom teaching across Canada. My guess is that you have struck a blow for orderliness in the language teaching customs in Canada and if I may predict, I honestly think that you will be able to discern within the next year or so across our country some changes which are the direct result of your presence here with us this morning.

On the second day of the Seminar delegates were given an opportunity of assessing different methods of teaching languages. Groups of children from Ottawa and district schools were brought in and three expert teachers guided them through demonstration lessons.

THE OTTAWA DEMONSTRATION

A demonstration of the methods used in teaching French in Ottawa public schools was conducted by Mrs. Marguerite Travers and a Grade eight class from Hopewell Public School. Following it, these questions were put to Miss Florence Bradford, who is Supervisor of French for the Ottawa Public School Board:

Q: Do you have written work and grammar?

Miss Bradford: The course is oral. That is our main consideration. When they get to Grade seven, which was last year for these pupils, we introduce a little written work and our first introduction to formal grammar. Now we thought this out very carefully because we did not want the flow of French to be interrupted for grammar and, you see, they have been learning grammar from Grade two up but they don't know it. When they get to Grade seven, we thought they were old enough to introduce certain grammatical work forms, like "er" verbs and those are very carefully thought out. That is where we stress the use of our manual in our schools because by doing it a certain way, we don't get off on the wrong foot. The written work will also be kept to a minimum in Grade eight because we feel we have them at an age when the oral work is what they can do best.

Q: Are the children in the demonstration class above average?

Miss Bradford: No. This is an average class. We have what we call gifted children in the class but the children you see are average and they are not our gifted ones.

Q: When do you introduce reading?

Miss Bradford: Reading is introduced at the end of Grade three. They don't see a word of French written or printed in Grade two at all. They don't see any in Grade three until Easter. After Easter we introduce our first book and the first book, in fact all the books, are based right on the topics which we have studied orally. They do not read anything except what they have first studied orally.

Q: What is the teaching load of a teacher teaching 20-minute periods of French?

Miss Bradford: Well, it is quite heavy. As a matter of fact, you can't be an itinerant French teacher in the Ottawa Public Schools without working very hard. I can tell you this because I have been an itinerant French teacher myself. It really is hard work because you are talking all day long. Now I think Mrs. Travers, if I recollect correctly, has 15 classrooms of four periods, 20 minutes a week. I think that is her timetable. A teacher has several schools and the timetable is arranged so there is time for travel and also some spare time. You couldn't teach an oral lesson for an hour. That is impossible!

Q: What coordination is there between elementary and high schools?

Miss Bradford: At the present time, we have a very good liaison with the high schools and have kept them aware of what we are doing. That is to say, our teachers have visited the high schools and high school teachers have come to visit ours. But in September 1964, a class will be going up into Grade nine which will have had French from Grade two up. The collegiates are really co-operating with us, and I am very happy about that, but I think there will have to be quite a radical change when these children with seven years of French reach them.

Q: What procedures do you use for marking tests?

Miss Bradford: We have grade teachers teaching up to Grade five. They do four-fifths of the work, that is to say, they teach four 15-minute periods and the itinerant teacher teaches one. When I have in-service training courses, I say to them, "Now you have a lot of things to get used to." If you don't mark the report the first month or second month, if your principal approves, that is quite alright with me. But after that they are expected to give the children marks. What I tell them is to mark them on their oral work. In other words not just "Oh, John seems to be very good. He must be worth a 1" and "This boy is not too good, he is worth a 4." Not like that. I suggest they have a little card in their hand and every day try and mark a certain group of pupils. In other words, we are trying to make the test definitely oral. In our old course when we did use quite a bit of English, even when they started Grade five we used to give comprehension tests, but we don't do that now. We have to give an oral mark and from time to time during regular classes teachers mark the class on the flat statements. I ask questions all around and I try to grade the class that way for our own interest. We haven't had a real survey of these children in our new classes yet. We do keep our text oral because we are teaching oral French.

Q: What kind of answers are the children taught to give?

Miss Bradford: We train them to give full answers because we are not teaching them grammar as grammar. They are trained right from Grade two to give a full answer. We find when we come to our grammar in Grade seven they have very little difficulty learning the verb forms because they have grown up on this system of negatives and affirmatives together.

Q: Do you let them practise the interrogative form?

Miss Bradford: Yes. Sometimes the pupils take over the class and ask the questions. You are not always going to be on the answering end in a conversation, are you? I have seen a whole class where a grade teacher has row on row stand up and quickly ask questions all over the class.

THE ST. CLOUD DEMONSTRATION

The second demonstration was conducted with Grade seven pupils of Ottawa's Glashan Public School and featured the St. Cloud Method. The teacher was Miss Jeannette Hulek, teacher-demonstrator for the method in North America.

Using a slide projector and a tape recorder, photographs were flashed on to a screen and appropriate sentences repeated from the recorder. Pupils were asked to try to repeat what they heard.

Miss Hulek explained that French was the heart of the St. Cloud Method. It had been developed at the French government school at St. Cloud. German and Spanish programs had been added later. While the method was not new, she said it was comparatively new to North America.

She explained that Chilton Books Inc., of Philadelphia and Toronto, had a contract with the French government for the production of course materials. Part of the agreement included the training of teachers. Miss Hulek said that a teacher training centre is to be established in Philadelphia shortly to train teachers exclusively in the St. Cloud Method.

THE TAN GAU DEMONSTRATION

The Tan Gau Method was introduced by one of its originators, Dr. Robert Gauthier, Director of French Instruction for the Ontario Department of Education, and presented by Paul Jodoin, teacher at Ottawa Glebe Collegiate, with a class of students -- not one of whom had had a French lesson before -- from North Gower Township. Dr. Gauthier then answered the following questions:

Q: Doesn't your method call for a highly gifted and enthusiastic teacher?

Dr. Gauthier: It takes vitality. It takes a fluent knowledge of the language. But haven't we reached a time in Canada when we want to teach the second language properly, be it English or French? I think the time of make believe is past. Again I say, we need to train teachers and I am quite sure that among Canadians there are many, perhaps not as perfect as M. Jodoin, but there are a number of enthusiastic persons who would like to do this kind of work if they received the proper training. It takes more than an ordinary teacher. It takes an actor. But every good teacher must be somewhat of an actor, if I judge actors by my good friend M. Vinay. You have to show life.

Q: When a child learns his native tongue he learns it from the beginning. When a child learns another tongue, should he learn it the same way as his mother tongue? Are we training him to translate instead of giving an automatic response?

Dr. Gauthier: A second language should be learned the same way as the mother tongue because that is the natural method. I didn't invent that. I didn't get the idea myself in the first place. I picked it up in Burma from this good man Tan-Wan Yan who worked on this for 20 years, and we have seen since 1954-55 that it gives good results, provided that the teacher is competent.

To your second question, I will give you an instance which I think showed us right away that there is no translation. A teacher was using a large mural showing the family at the table and after speaking only French and describing the various actions of the members of the family, he said in French "Est-ce-que le papa mange sa soupe avec sa fourchette?" and there was a general burst of laughter. There was no translation but an automatic reaction. The action took the place of words. Speaking is not only a repetition of words. Speaking is an intelligent action and sounds of a new language have to come into the ear to be interpreted by the mind and then motor nerves have to activate the vocal organs. This is a whole process here. We, by giving the sounds of the new language, are beginning to get the sounds interpreted by the mind. I don't see any danger of translation.

You saw here, in the space of 20 minutes, a concentration of what I would say was a week's work. These expressions, you see, have to be drilled. They have to be fixed in the pupils' minds. It is not because they understand them now but they will retain them and so there has to be repetition and if you have four or five periods a week so much the better.

Q: How soon will pupils begin to answer in phrases?

Dr. Gauthier: Well, Tan Gau says don't be too much in a hurry. If you are, the pupils will mispronounce French words and those mispronunciations will be difficult to correct or to eradicate. But if you wait for them to come in their own time, they will speak just as well as their teachers. There is something that surprises, we hadn't expected. I was in one school listening to the pupils answering and they never made any mistakes with the use of the gender in French. I said to M. the teacher,"I always thought that English-speaking people were embarrassed with the gender." But the pupils never made any mistakes. The teacher replied, "Well, they have no problems because we never created problems for them. We never said, 'Now look out, this word is feminine so we must use 'une' instead of 'un' or 'la' instead of 'le'." No, we never said that, but we always give the gender along with the noun in a package. As you saw there were no single words, but always units of language.

Q: Have you established, from this method, the earliest age at which children can best take up a second language?

Dr. Gauthier: Well, there is quite a debate on the ideal age at which children should begin the study of a second language. You know Dr. Penfield is of the theory, that the younger the better, even at three or four. I think that from a certain point of view he is right, but I am not quite sure that from a teacher's point of view he is right. I am a good friend of Dr. Penfield and we have discussed it and have agreed to disagree on that. I can think of a number of French-speaking pupils who were forced to learn both French and English simultaneously, at the age of six, and who, at the age of adolescence were mixed up. I think that the first language should be reasonably well established before the second one comes into play. I say, in a formal way, that there is no trouble in exposing these children to the sound of a new language if they have playmates who are of a different language. I think they are fortunate, because they will get the sounds of the language in a natural way and that won't disturb them, but they should not be taught a new language before they have arrived at seven or eight if they are average children. The bright ones can always be tortured pedagogically and they will respond. The average child, if tortured in this way, may not respond. He will suffer and that is very serious. It goes beyond the nerves. That is my theory.

Q: Have you ever discovered in your method that there was some degree of misunderstanding?

Dr. Gauthier: I didn't know a word of English once because I came from a part of Canada where we never heard any English. My father planted me in an English class here in Ottawa and, I tell you, I never found out the name of the teacher at first. I thought he was called "altogether." I didn't know anything of what was going on for a few days, for a few weeks, and yet that is the way I learned English. I think it is the natural way and I say it with that much ease because it was Tan-Wan in Burma who gave me the idea. I just picked it up and we found out that it works. It doesn't interfere with the oral, or direct method or any other method, but it takes good teachers.

THE
LANGUAGE
LABORATORIES:

An Appraisal

by
Professor André Rigault
Director
University Language Laboratory
McGill University

Although it is a newcomer in the field of teaching modern languages (it dates back only to the late forties or early fifties), the Language Laboratory has spread over the entire world, and particularly over this continent, with astonishing speed.

In the U.S.A., thousands of primary schools, high schools, colleges and universities, now possess this electronic marvel, and thanks to the National Defense Education Act, many more are being installed or planned for the near future. The situation is pretty much the same in the European countries I have visited recently -- Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Sweden.

In this country, nearly all universities and colleges, and a great number of high schools and "collèges classiques", are becoming adepts of the audio-lingual way of teaching modern languages.

Favorable reports have been issued by educators. Salesmen are increasing their pressure over the school boards, principals and language teachers. It has become fashionable to buy the new gadget. Quite naturally, schools and educators who have not yet complied with this new fashion of teaching languages realize their backwardness and feel an awful complex of frustration. Most language teachers, with the exception of a few pedagogues still stubbornly lagging behind their times, experience an intense desire to be in the swim, and keep an envious eye on their happier colleagues.

In short, it seems that language teachers now have within their reach the ideal tool for teaching modern languages. What is it exactly all about?

I would like to take the opportunity in this paper of reviewing the basic aspects of the Language Laboratory, to raise questions which, I hope, will be discussed and answered by the floor. Time has perhaps come to pin-point facts, and see how far we have got in the field of Language Laboratories.

First of all, I would like to review briefly the basic linguistic principles underlying audio-lingual teaching.

1. Language is speech. (It is sometimes recorded with graphic symbols.)

   - Speech is communication by voice sounds according to the conventions of the language.

   - Voice sounds involve many delicate kinds of inflections which cannot be recorded by the ordinary graphic symbols used in writing the language. These sounds can only be learned by imitating a native speaker or a speaker with a native accent.

   - Speech is a skill, like swimming, ice skating, playing the piano.

   - All skills involve neuro-muscular coordination which is achieved only through practice. Practice means repetition.

   - Children learn their native speech by imitating frequently repeated sounds of their elders.

   - Skills are not learned by intellectual process. You do not learn to play the piano by sitting at a desk and studying sheets of music nor by listening only to a teacher in a classroom explain harmony, the scales and the rules of composition. In the same way, it is impossible to learn a foreign language merely by reading and listening to a teacher talk about language and grammar rules.

2. The analysis and teaching of the language must be based on the spoken form. Traditional grammar is only concerned with visual signs (i.e. s plural in most French nouns and adjectives, nt in the third person plural of French verbs). Correct spelling often consists in writing letters that are not pronounced. We now know that there is a great difference between the grammar of the spoken language and the grammar of the written language; the former should be taught first.

3. The acquisition of the spoken forms must precede the acquisition of the written forms. This is the normal process when a child is learning his mother tongue.

4. The language must be taught by structures and structural segments. Those structures should be presented in an efficient order, one

at a time, in order of increasing difficulty. They should be mastered systematically by means of drills.

At this point, I may already raise a few questions. It is true that for the descriptive linguist -- or linguistician (that is a specialist of the science of language) -- language is first and foremost speech.

Nobody can deny that children learn their native tongue by imitation. However, is it true that acquisition of the spoken form of a second language should precede the acquisition of the written form? Should the linguist derive from his experience as a descriptive scientist, a rule that should hold true in the field of pedagogy?

Should we not take into consideration the different audio-oral abilities of the various age-groups? An entirely oral method would certainly work very well with children in the kindergarten or in the third or fourth grades. But what about high school or college students? It seems that the older the pupil is, the more visual he becomes.

I have witnessed the wonderful job done in first grades at Weston School in Westmount by my colleague Thérèse Férault. This school started bilingual teaching some years ago with very good results. When I visited the school for the last time in 1959, most of the Grade four children had nearly achieved bilingualism. However, it must be pointed out that French is taught several hours a day, that not only French is taught in French but also geography, arithmetic and other subjects; that French teachers are native French speakers as well as competent phoneticians. This is perhaps the best solution to the problem of teaching a second language and I have heard that other schools are now following the same pattern as Weston.

At the high school and college level, the situation seems quite different. My friend and colleague Fernand Marty, one of the best specialists on Language Laboratories and, for many years the enthusiastic supporter of an entirely oral method for modern language beginners at the college level, confessed to me last spring that the results he achieved 10 years ago by presenting the written and spoken languages side by side, were as good as the ones he has obtained later with a purely oral method.

This is not to say that the spoken language should not be taught. I, for one, am a staunch supporter of the teaching of the spoken word. However, I think that before delaying the teaching of the written word for a long time, a teacher should make a careful decision. In many instances, the spoken and the written word should be presented side by side.

My second point deals with the various types of Language Laboratories.

1. Group practice

TYPE 1 - LISTEN : Each student booth is equipped with a set of earphones and connected to the master console from which the master program originates. Students listen to the program through headphones and, during pauses, answer or repeat.

TYPE 2 - LISTEN-RESPOND (Audio-active) :

Each student booth is now provided with a microphone and an amplifier. Students listen, through headphones, to the master program originating from the console, repeat or answer during pauses, and at the same time they are speaking they hear their voice amplified or "audio-activated". "Audio-activation", when the amplifier balances the sound so that students hear their own words amplified, is supposed -- quite rightly, I think -- to help students to hear better. It is also claimed that students are able to detect their errors more easily. However, this last point has not yet been proved.

TYPE 3 - LISTEN - RESPOND - RECORD - COMPARE :

Each booth is now equipped with a dual-channel tape-recorder. Students listen to the program played at the master console. This program is recorded on the student tape (on the student track). During pauses, students repeat -- or answer -- and record their own sentences on their tape (on the student track). At the end of the exercise, a student tape contains both the master program and student responses. Students may then rewind their tape and listen to both the master program and their answers for comparison and self-evaluation.

TYPE 4 - LISTEN - RESPOND - RECORD - COMPARE - CORRECT :

In this case, the teacher will duplicate the master tape in as many copies (student tapes) as needed. The master program is recorded on the master track of the student tape.

Each student is given a copy (pre-recorded student tape) when entering the Language Laboratory. The program being already recorded on student tapes, student booths are disconnected from the master console; i.e. each booth becomes an autonomous unit.

Students listen to the program (pre-recorded on the master track of their tape), respond, and record their answers on the student track of their tape.

At the end of the exercise, a student tape contains both the master program (on the master track) and student responses (on the student track). Students rewind their tape and listen to both the master program and their answers for comparison and self-evaluation.

Students may then listen to the program another time and record their answers a second time (the first recording of answers is automatically erased). In fact, students may correct their answers as many times as they wish.

Students have no control on the master track. Hence the master program (recorded on the master track of the student tape) cannot be altered in any way by students. The master program being recorded permanently, each student tape can be used in succession, by several students studying the same program.

Type 4 should be used when monitoring is done by an instructor. Since all students in the group are provided with their own pre-recorded tape, they work individually. Thus, the instructor is able to monitor any student without disturbing other students in his group. The student who is being monitored can stop his tape-recorder while he receives individual advice from the instructor, then he starts his tape-recorder again when the instructor has completed his monitoring with him, and goes to another student.

One can ask: What type of Language Laboratory is the best one? Or to put the question another way, what type of Language Laboratory gives the best dividends for the money that has been invested?

Type 1 should be discarded. Audio-activation is essential. Type 4 is undoubtedly the most elaborate, the most flexible, hence one may be tempted to decide to get one. However, it is also the most expensive, about $450 per student position, that is about $13,500 for

30 positions. Is it certain that it is at the same time the most efficient?

From reports I have received from the U.S.A., it seems that no significant differences in language achievement are shown between students who have used the Language Laboratory No. 2 (Audio activation) and those who have used type No. 3 or 4 (Listen-Record-Compare, or Listen-Record-Compare-Correct).

A colleague of mine, who is now chairman of the Department of Modern Languages in an American university, wrote to me in July 1961:

> "After four years of rather extensive experience at Purdue University, I became convinced that individual recording facilities at each student position were a waste of money. Extensive discussions with colleagues in the Speech Department further convinced me; for it was their opinion that the language learner -- at least during the beginning stages -- is incapable of recording and correcting himself. He plays back and hears what he wants to hear".

I would rather say that students hear only what their ears -- tuned to their mother tongue -- are able to detect.

Quite advanced experiments have been conducted at Wayne State University, under George Borglum's direction, and the Wayne experience was again that recording facilities were desirable only as a part-time operation.

It seems that the recording of students is far more necessary for more advanced students. Since a Language Laboratory of the 2nd type costs only $4,500 for 30 positions, as compared with about $13,500 for type 4, it is important to think over the problem before making a decision.

As a matter of fact, one of the reasons why Language Laboratories of type No. 3 or 4 do not give better results than Laboratories of type 2, is the fact that most students are just unable to detect their errors easily, that is, to compare with accuracy their answer to the version given by the master program. This is particularly true in the field of pronunciation and morphology (in vocabulary and syntax errors are detected more easily).

In my opinion, a Language Laboratory of type 3 or 4, can be used efficiently only if an instructor is present and helps the students detect their errors and correct them. This is to say, that not only the Language Laboratory program does not serve as a substitute for the teacher, as it has been frequently claimed, but it even demands -- in order to be used effectively -- more teachers, or imposes a heavier load on the teacher.

Consequently, before entering the Language Laboratory business, principals and language teachers would be well advised to ask the following questions: What is our aim? What amount of money should be spent? How many additional teachers or monitors can we have?

If students are going to work all alone in the Language Laboratory, or if only one teacher must take care of 30 students, then, in my opinion, it is useless to spend the money in buying a laboratory of the 3rd or 4th type. A laboratory of the second type will do the job at considerable savings.

May I add that the choice of a Language Laboratory is a delicate business and that language teachers and principals would be well-advised in consulting a teacher specialist in Language Laboratories before making a decision.

Salesmen, even when they are well-intentioned, are neither electronic engineers nor language teachers. Engineers, on their side, are apt to build beautiful machines that are inadequate for the teaching of languages.

Finally, the decision as to the type of equipment and the connections to be provided, rests upon the teacher, for he is the user and he should set the criterion for a tool he will be using almost everyday of the week.

The questions I have raised so far are apt to lead you, I am afraid, to believe that I have doubts about the usefulness of Language Laboratories.

This is certainly not so. I firmly believe that all schools teaching a second language should be equipped with at least a laboratory of the 2nd type.

A teacher has a threefold job: (1) he explains the structure of the language; (2) he gives the right example, i.e. acts as a model speaker; and (3) he corrects students.

Only the teacher can perform tasks (1) and (3) (explanation, correction). But the model utterances to be imitated by students can be spoken by a native voice recorded on tape. The laboratory is the answer to the problem of teachers who have some doubts about the fluency and correctness of their speech in a foreign language. Even when the teacher is a native speaker of the foreign language, the laboratory is essential, for it relieves him from endless repetitions.

In fact, let us consider the task of the teacher who is trying to achieve the teaching of aural understanding and speaking of a second language with traditional methods. In an "ideal-sized" language class of 20 students, suppose that each student speaks for one minute. This would consume 20 minutes in a 30-minute period. Only 10 minutes are left for the teacher's questions, corrections, examples, and repetition. Moreover, each student must listen to his 19 friends' pronunciation which is incorrect; thus, for 19 minutes, he is induced into developing wrong speech habits.

In the Language Laboratory, during a 30-minute session, and assuming that the instructor devotes one minute and a half correcting individually each of the 20 students, each one of these is able to speak out in the foreign language during 28 minutes and a half! In addition, each student listens to the program coming from the master console and hears nothing but correct foreign speech.

The Language Laboratory makes it possible for each student in the group to hear the language pronounced correctly, talk, hear himself, compare his elocution with the teacher's. This must be done with help from the teacher which can be given to an individual student without interrupting the rest of the class.

In short, the Language Laboratory offers the following advantages over the traditional classroom:

1. Time practice: students make full use of the practice period.

2. Repetition: the student is always repeating in imitation of a proficient performance. He may repeat as many times as he wishes.

3. Isolation: each student is isolated by partition and headphones. This, in effect, creates the ideal educational situation of one student -- one teacher. It avoids chorus responses (in an ordinary class most of the students do not have the experience of responding as individuals).

4. Self-monitoring: the student listens to his own responses through headphones, i.e. better than it is possible with the ordinary bone-conduction through which he normally hears himself. Hearing one's self at the time of speaking through the medium of electronic amplification introduces a kind of "neuromuscular feedback" which greatly aids the attempt at exact imitation.

5. Comparison teacher -- student pronunciation: since both the master voice and the student imitation are recorded on the same tape (on two different tracks) it is claimed that the student is able to compare his pronunciation and elocution with the teacher's, and correct himself. But I have already expressed some doubts on that point.

6. Multiple native master voices: master tapes can be recorded by different teachers. Thus students have an opportunity to receive the experience of different accents, male and female voices, young and old voices, etc.

As for the type of exercises to be used in the Language Laboratory, these are so varied that it would be hardly possible for me to mention all of them here.

I would like to emphasize only two points which seem essential. It would be a waste of time to use, in language laboratory teaching, methods or manuals designed to teach the written language. To be more specific, most of the manuals available are based on the grammar of the written language. Language Laboratory programs that aim at teaching the spoken language should be based on an actual, accurate description of the spoken word.

For example, traditional French grammars dealing only with the written language say that the feminine of adjectives is indicated by the addition of the letter e, unless the masculine form already ends with an e.

An exercise based on this description will be useless in the Language Laboratory. Exercises for oral practice must be based on the formation of the feminine of adjectives in the spoken language.

From the spoken point of view, the following categories of feminine exist: I. In some cases, no change is heard: vouse êtes fier, vouse êtes fière. II. When changes occur, it may be one of the following: (1) Addition of a consonant sound: droi(t) - droite; chau(d) - chaude; gri(s) - grise. (2) Addition of a consonant sound with modification of the preceding vowel sound: premie(r) (close é) - première (open è + r); so(t) (close o) - sotte (open o + t); canadien (nasal vowel) - canadienne (non nasal vowel + n). (3) The final consonant is replaced by another: vif - vive; neuf - neuve. (4) The vowel sound is modified and the final consonant is replaced by another: voyageur (open eu + r) - voyageuse (close eu + z).

Students must be systematically trained in pronouncing the feminine of adjectives in French. First, because such an opposition between the pronunciation of the masculine and feminine of adjectives does not exist in spoken English; therefore they are not accustomed to it. Secondly, because many changes that occur when changing the masculine to the feminine in French adjectives are not obvious in spelling.

Another important point is this: Difficulties (whether phonetical, morphological or syntactical) should be presented only one at a time, and at least six, or better, eight, examples of the same difficulty should be mastered in succession. This is what is called "pattern drills".

A pattern is quite an abstract thing, and cannot be mastered as such. In fact, in speech, only a certain number of sentences having the same construction, or structure, make a pattern.

With the traditional grammatical approach, once the "rule" has been given, students are asked to "apply" the rule to two or three examples. The Language Laboratory makes it possible to practice those patterns more systematically and efficiently.

However, you should remember that pattern practice is quite boring. In my opinion, exercises using pattern drills should not exceed five minutes at a time. In other words, teachers must find a rhythm, a sequence of presentation in which successive exercises are varied enough to keep the student interested.

This is what we are trying to do at McGill in our first-year French course. Each tape, of a 25-minute duration, contains:

1.	a pronunciation drill	(4')
2.	a dictation	(5')
3.	a French song, or poem	(1')
4.	drills based on idiomatic expressions	(4')
5.	grammar drills	(5')
6.	a French song or a poem	(1')
7.	a comprehension piece followed by questions	(5')

It must be said that the elaboration of an aural-oral course for the laboratory, the writing of the script, the recording of the text, require a great deal of the teacher's time. Teachers who are in charge of the laboratory should have, I think, a reduced teaching load.

The true conclusion of this paper, will be your remarks, criticisms, observations and questions. However, I would like to answer myself at least one question I asked at the beginning of my talk: "Have we got, with the Language Laboratory, the ideal tool for teaching modern languages?"

"Ideal" is not perhaps the right word. For, in my view, the ideal tool will always remain the good teacher. However, I am certain that we now possess a tool, which properly used, is extremely useful.

We could hardly imagine physical education without a gymnasium, piano classes without pianos, instruction in physics without experimentation. The time will come when it will be hard to imagine language teaching without a Language Laboratory.

QUESTIONS -- and ANSWERS by Professor Rigault

Q: What provision is being made to help teachers in the use of language laboratory equipment?

Prof. Rigault: Well, as far as I know, I don't think there has been any seminar specifically on the use of linguistic laboratories in Canada. However, I do know that some courses have been offered at Laval University, University of Montreal and McGill University within the frame of larger courses. For instance, at McGill we have a course on applied linguistics for French teachers. This course is attended by students taking other courses in translation structure and so on, so they have an opportunity to get good training but I don't think there is a seminar like some universities in the United States where, for one week, sometimes two weeks, teachers are trained on how to make plans and blueprints for a language laboratory and how to use a language laboratory for teaching. Perhaps somebody could give more detail about this point.

One delegate: In Alberta the new Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta has an experimental language lab for teachers so they can practise with it.

Another delegate: In B.C. we have a language lab. We run a course for teachers so they can learn how to use the equipment and we have in-service training courses for making up tapes.

Q: When do you give explanations in your lessons?

Prof. Rigault: A language laboratory is just for practice. As the teaching involves explanations, they should be given in the classroom. At McGill in all courses in the French upper school, students meet in the classroom for 25 minutes, and for the next 25 minutes, they proceed to the language laboratory where they practice what has been explained to them during the first period of the hour.

Perhaps I can ask a question of someone myself. Is it legal to borrow someone's tape and make a copy of it?

T.V. Dobson (Copp Clark Pub. Co. Ltd.): We do not make tapes and loan them. We sell them. Therefore, it would be a violation of copyright to copy them.

Q: What part does a teacher play in evaluation of tapes?

Prof. Rigault: I think that the teacher plays an essential part in evaluating or helping a student to evaluate his elocution in rendering the correctness of his version, assuming, of course, that the teacher is himself able to compare the models spoken by the native speaker and the sentences spoken by the student. This is where I think training in linguistics would help teachers a great deal. Teachers with a good training in phonetics, in the structure of the foreign language, even if they are not able to speak that language fluently without any accent, should be able to detect errors. Frankly, I don't think, at least at the beginning, that students can detect their errors. They should be taught how to recognize their errors and this is a part of the process of learning a language. You have heard the phrase, "They hear only what they are accustomed to hear." Their hearing system is tuned to the basic frequencies of their mother language and the ear is acting as a filter which tends to distort and transform the sound of a foreign language.

Q: If a student hears mistakes and doesn't recognize his mistakes, how effective is it for him to hear his own response when he makes it?

Prof. Rigault: That is a very good question, and it is very hard to answer indeed. I have the impression that students hear better when they not only hear themselves through normal ear conduction or bone conduction, but when they hear their voice amplified. For students with high oral discrimination, this is enough. I would say that perhaps 20 percent of our students in first year at McGill are able to detect their errors and 80 percent are not so successful. This is mainly a psychological problem, I should say.

APPLICATIONS of PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION and TELEVISION to the TEACHING of MODERN LANGUAGES

by
Dr. E.N. Wright
Research Associate
Board of Education
for the City of Toronto

When I was requested to address you, the topic of this session was changed from solely a consideration of programmed instruction to include the use of television. I strongly suspect that Toronto's use of television for French instruction is one reason for this change, so I shall briefly note the results of these studies further on.

I wish to first consider the nature of these two media of instruction. At no time shall I attempt to detail for you what belongs in a modern language curriculum. You will note, however, that any given medium of instruction tends to emphasize certain facets of the curriculum. What emphasis you·desire, should in large measure determine the instructional mode you adopt.

Television is a powerful transmitter of information. It can carry pictorial information, aural information and print information. It can carry information of the immediate present as well as information of the past that has been stored on film or tape. I understand that most people believe one of the best places to learn a foreign language is in the country where it is spoken. Television is a medium that can approximate such an environment. Though it is unreasonable to take every foreign language student to another country for his lessons, it is not unreasonable to import, through television, elements of the foreign land.

The medium of television has been strongly attacked on the grounds that it is a passive medium. Televised instruction has a major drawback but this is not it. I should like to take you back first, to a World War II study (Hovland, Lumsdaine & Sheffield, 1949). Servicemen learning the Morse code symbols, Able Baker Charlie, etc., were required to respond with the correct word when a letter went on the screen. Those who participated in this fashion displayed better learning than the others who only watched. It is not difficult to prepare material, for television, to which the students must respond orally at appropriate intervals. I maintain that "good" television requires another type of participation. You will note the use of the word "good". I feel very strongly that most instructional television to date has been bad television. It may have been good pedagogy, the lessons may have been well prepared, but the medium was not well or fully utilized. To return to my point, "good" television requires active audience participation. The show is a series of shots; for instance the first scene will be in the house, the next in the car, next in the office. You, the viewer, are presented with only the high spots of the story. You must complete the details: the trip from house to car, the starting of the car, the arrival at work, and so on. In another way, television minimizes details. The electronic characteristics of the medium limit the amount of pictorial information that can be transmitted. Backgrounds are fuzzy and indistinct, three people on the screen is a crowd, though this is not true of film. The television camera works close to its story, a shot of the distance is meaningless. The viewer must actively participate, completing the details. This is just as active participation as the visualization of the details recorded in words on the printed page.

Television does have an instructional Achilles heel, one that concerns me greatly. Essentially every student is receiving the same material at the same time. This is a complete negation of all the current cries to individualize instruction. I grant that there are indeed situations where it is useful, indeed necessary, to have not just one student or one class, but most classes of a certain grade level, in the whole school system, receiving the same material. When different people go to a foreign land, the natives do not change their behaviour to accommodate the various differences between these people, who are learning to speak the language. When we wish to present the milieu in which the language is learned then television is ideal. If you decide that there is material which all students can use at the same time then again television can be helpful. Do not fool yourself that you can adequately allow for individual differences while using television. It will not progress as fast as the most able student, so he will be held back. The slower student may, through dint of additional work in the classroom, be prepared for tomorrow's lesson, and then the next day's, but I suggest that it is essential to note well, exactly what limitations are placed on the instruction by television. Do not consider this to be too damning a commentary on the medium of television. Most instruction today is bound by the curriculum, the text, the final examination, and though we pay lip-service to the individual, our instruction often pays as little attention to individualization as does television.

Though I have said television does not allow for individual differences, yet, in one sense, it does. The medium requires active participation on the part of the student. The type of activity and the amount of participation will vary from student to student and class to class. The major problem is that we have no real evidence on what is occurring. We know little enough about the process of reading and extracting meaning from print, and we know less about extracting information from pictorial material.

As I move now to programmed instruction as a medium of instruction, it may for a moment sound like a panacea, for here is a device that holds as a major claim to distinction its ability to provide for individualization. It is not a panacea and when it does make some allowances for the individual or small groups, the traditional administrative scheduling can be exploded. Let me tell you a little story. Dr. Lou Eigen, of the Centre for Programmed Instruction, has prepared a very good programmed text that essentially covers much of the Grade nine Algebra course through the introduction of sets and functions. Out in Long Island, a Grade eight math teacher in a junior high school had a very bright class and she got permission to introduce this text around Christmas time. Her students ate it up. About the end of February, the teacher, wondering how the students had progressed, arranged to have them given a standardized test. The results indicated that the class had mastered Algebra so well that their marks were equivalent to those of students at the completion of Grade nine. The principal was furious and Lou Eigen got a phone call. Lou tells the story this way.

"The principal wanted to know what I was doing, giving the children Grade nine Algebra when they were only in Grade eight, and now that it had been done what was I going to do about it. I suggested that maybe, since they had finished their Grade nine Algebra they could take Grade 10 mathematics the following year. To this the principal replied that his was a junior high school and there were no Grade 10 mathematics teachers there. Then I suggested that possibly an arrangement could be worked out so that a Grade 10 math teacher could come over from the senior high school for the first period in the mornings. The principal grumbled and said well maybe something could be worked out. The really interesting problem is that the school system had a by-law, passed by the Board, that no teacher was to teach the work of the following grade."

The story illustrates some things of interest. The author of the programmed materials was blamed for the situation (the principal had recognized him as the teacher -- and in this case rightly so.) Provision for individualization, or, really for grouping in one subject and pacing according to the abilities of the group, can cause severe administrative problems. The problems of having children all working at their own pace is great. I personally am in favor of it, but the school will have to be reorganized to make the necessary provisions for all the variations that will arise.

I have not yet dealt with programming for language instruction. As you know, there are several types of programming. The one that most of you are familiar with is the linear type. Other types, including Crowder's scrambled book, Pressey's machines, and the pull-tab for diagnosis and trouble-shooting, have been developed. A popular position today is a combination of linear programming and branching. Ideally this would be a small step, constructed response program with provision for branching. The number of possibilities of incorrect responses, the different amounts of material for students at different ability levels, and other such considerations, make the construction of such a program practically impossible at present.

For language instruction, the obvious choice at present would seem to be the linear-type, constructed response program.

Let me proceed for a few more minutes with some of the positive and negative characteristics of this medium of instruction. I have already dealt with the aspect of individualization. Essentially there is no limitation in the type of response which can be utilized and recorded. The subject can respond verbally, write a response, push a button, draw a curve or a line. Where we have instances in which the machine cannot tell which is the correct answer, we have the machine present the correct answer and allow the subject to decide whether his response is correct. We can use printed materials, filmed materials, taped materials. The new 8 m.m. cartridge loaded film projector makes possible a variety of moving materials. The slide-projector harnessed to a tape recorder has already been used experimentally. Technology is at the point where you can program your lessons using any material you wish. The limits are financial, not technical. The only limiting factor in programming materials is that the pacing must be student controlled, whether directly or indirectly. I add the latter because in some of the work with computers, the pace of presentation has depended on the speed and accuracy of the student's responses.

What is the negative side of programmed materials? As I have pointed out, our school organization is not ready for a truly individualized program. I shall pause for 30 seconds while you all give thought to a class of students working at different material at different speeds, so designed that the student is learning what he is covering: How do you mark these children, all of whom are doing good work, who are learning equally well, but at different speeds? What kind of examinations do you use? How do you decide what programs should be done next? How do you do your time-tabling? You may add like questions of your own.

A second negative aspect can be circumvented but seldom is. The programming mode you adopt is usually inflexible. The amount of material presented in each step is physically fixed by the format. The type of response you can cope with is usually limited, often to writing. To develop a program with deverse forms of responding is demanding, expensive, and usually not attempted.

If I have dwelt at some length on the characteristics of these two instructional media it is because these characteristics are critical. I wish to reiterate, that no matter what instructional medium you adopt, it has certain inherent characteristics which place limitations on your content. Furthermore, if you attempt to use a conventional program but feed it in through one of the newer media, you will suffer doubly: the good qualities of your existing program will be distorted by this new medium and you will, at the same time, not benefit from some of the unique qualities of the medium.

Let me switch now to some concrete examples of applications of the two instructional modes for the teaching of modern languages. As you may be aware, the Toronto Board of Education has been for the past three years experimenting with the teaching of French in the elementary grades. The word 'experimenting' has been correctly used in this case for the programs have been conducted in co-operation with the Research Department. The first study compared film with regular classroom instruction, the latter doing significantly better, a difference attributed to the inflexibility of the films. The film series was "French Through Pictures", produced by Language Research Incorporated, Harvard University. They were based on the I.A. Richards material which you likely have seen in paper-back.

These students were followed through the first year of Grade nine where an intensive analysis of their performance was conducted in comparison to students without the aural-oral French experience in elementary school. In many of the comparisons no significant differences were found. The follow-up study did point to one important aspect to consider in further studies of language programs. Where significant differences were uncovered they were not in total scores. For an error analysis, 13 categories of errors were established. Here some of the significant differences were noted. I shall not go into details on the various analyses that were conducted. It is enough to note that there are many aspects of learning a modern language and total scores may be misleading. It is necessary to consider the various aspects of language learning and examine them separately in terms of the instructional program.

In the television study two modes of instruction were used. First, "French Through Pictures" was presented via closed-circuit television to some of the classes. It should be remembered that this series of films was originally intended for use over television. The other classrooms had what was called the "Book-tape" method. They used the paper-back book from which the films were developed, supplemented by tape-recordings played through the school's P.A. system. The tapes presented the same content as appeared in the sound-track of the film. The differences between the two presentations, which seemed most important at the time study was mounted, were two. There were four pictures to a page in the paper-back so that the student's attention could not be focused on a single picture at a time. In the film there was one point where each picture was presented without caption. This condition never occurred in the "Book-tape" method.

Two other variables investigated at the same time were four 15-minute periods per week, against two 30-minute periods and Grade seven versus Grade eight. The two 30-minute periods were shown to be superior, the Grade eight students did better than the Grade seven students, and the "Book-tape" group did better than the television group. I should add that both groups had an itinerant teacher once a week. These teachers followed certain pre-determined procedures for all groups. Their purpose was to compensate for weaknesses noted in the materials by the earlier study. This finding should not be interpreted as a condemnation of television but rather as an indication that this organization of material did not take as much advantage of the medium of television as it did of the combined medium of sound and print! If you look carefully at the I.A. Richards material you will see that it is sharp and well defined. There is no background, no incomplete data. The student was not given an opportunity to be active in the way I suggested they should be active with television.

In moving to programmed instruction, let me first refer to a recent book, Programs '62, prepared by the Centre for Programmed Instruction (1962). This is a compilation listing all programmed material available commercially this fall. To be included, the publisher had to have at least one sample page of material ready for the book this spring. To me, the most surprising feature of the book was the small number of available programs. Only 122 were listed. The bulk of programmed material you read about as having been used in experiments or in the process of being developed, unfortunately is not yet available and there is no guarantee it ever will be. Of the 122 programs, almost half were in the broad area of mathematics. Eight programs were language programs, four of them Spanish, one French. I have no doubt that all of you have at least received brochures on one of these programs. The majority of them deal solely with the language in its written form. Encyclopaedia Britannica has incorporated tape recorded materials into its programs.

I noted earlier that in some cases the student had to check his answer against the correct answer and determine whether he was correct or not. A major problem in learning another language is that the individual has trouble discriminating between sounds, where a specific discrimination is not necessary in his own language. The above-mentioned taped materials dodge this problem by having the students make discriminations and identify whether it was the first or second sound that was Spanish, or label two pictures with the first and second words. Though the student is required to respond aurally, he is not required to compare his pronunciation with a model pronunciation. Theoretically it is possible to develop a machine and a program that will permit the student to do this.

At this point may I interject a comment. As far as I know the language laboratory movement and the movement for programmed instruction have generally stayed far apart. Why has there not been more unity between the two groups? You may argue with me all you wish about the careful preparation of language laboratory tapes and I'll agree with you all the way down the line about the careful planning, etc., that has gone into them. I don't believe that the same approach used in programming materials for teaching machines has been used with the language laboratory and I think this is a golden opportunity that is being missed. Undoubtedly, as soon as I step down, I shall stand corrected for surely there must be some place where the best of both worlds is being combined.

There have been some studies of language using programmed materials but they have been few and far between. One study reports the learning of written German vocabulary (Ferster & Sapon, 1960). Essentially this was much like the way you may have learned vocabulary in high school. A series of sentences were read, translated, and the student checked his reply after each sentence, continuing through the material until he had two consecutive correct responses for each sentence. I cite this paltry study because, out of the gigantic reference work from which it is taken, this is the only investigation of programmed instruction involving language. One reason for the paucity of studies in this field lies, I believe, in testing problems. You may remember that I earlier referred to the fact that in the Toronto studies significant differences in one study were discovered when the detailed error analysis was carried out. There were no differences on the total test scores.

I am sure you will agree with me that language, in its totality, is the most complex subject to teach. Unfortunately, this type of a situation is one that researchers try to steer clear of. To be fair, there are a multiplicity of aspects to be tested, not all of which can be easily measured. Secondly, when looking at variations in methods, programming techniques and the like, the researcher wants material which will not introduce too many variables, so again the field of language is by-passed. To return again to the language laboratory, its arrival on the scene has, to some extent, kept programming out of the field of modern languages. Here already is a powerful tool, loudly proclaimed, liberally supported in the United States by N.D.E.A. Why would programming be felt in this field except indirectly? I make no condemnation, only a statement of fact.

I would like to refer to one of the more unusual programming devices and techniques now being explored. Licklider (1962), in a delightful article, discusses the use of computers for programmed instruction. Here modern languages have been chosen for many of the studies. Paired-associate learning has been all that was attempted; that is, strictly vocabulary. The topics under investigation have been various methods of using a computer, rather than the value of teaching languages this way. This aspect of language is one drill area that lends itself readily to computers. Here, dramatically, is illustrated the type of limitation imposed on instruction by the medium used. The gigantic computer is essentially only able to drill the student in written vocabulary, the same way you drilled yourself or your friends when you went to school.

What, then is the state of language instruction through the use of television and programmed instruction? Last week, I saw a report that noted two million students were seeing "Parlons Français" over television. The materials which Grollier has prepared for its machines have been industriously sold from door to door in the States. I personally know of several graduate students who purchased such materials to assist them in preparing for the language examinations required by their doctoral program. It is safe to say that these two methods are being used. It is also safe to say that we are far from having made optimum use of either medium. I know that many people are quite enthusiastic about "Parlons Français" and I have nothing against it. May I repeat that television can handle only certain aspects of the instructional program. If these are the only aspects that you wished covered then you need nothing but television. At present, it is probably the best way for conveying the spoken language to the child in a life-like situation. Yet there is no reason why techniques of programming cannot be applied to the preparation of television materials. Essentially this calls for a closer analysis of the performance we desire of the student and a series of programs that move him step by step in this direction.

I have also indicated programmed instruction in foreign languages is becoming more and more prevalent. Because of the commercial development of this instructional mode, my hunch is that on this continent, you will find as many or more programmed foreign language materials in private hands for use at home than in the schools! This might well give us something to think about. It may be a healthy state of affairs, it may not be, but if the home takes over some of the aspects of instruction, then you may find the demands made on the school will change. I would like to remind you again that programmed materials which seem to answer the needs for individualization will create complex administrative problems. Furthermore, the limitations of the hardware and the formats being used have sharply confined the aspects of language that can be taught this way.

In conclusion, consider what aspects of instruction can best be handled by each medium and use them accordingly.

* * *

REFERENCES

The Center for Programmed Instruction Inc. Programs, '62: A guide to programmed instructional materials available to educators by September 1962 Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962.

Ferster, C.B. & Sapon, S.M. An Application of Recent Development in Psychology to the Teaching of German. In Teaching Machines and Programmed Learning: A Source Book. A.A. Lumsdaine and R. Glaser (Eds.) Washington, D.C.: Department of Audio-Visual Instruction, National Education Association, 1960. Pp. 173-185.

Hovland, C.I., Lumsdaine, A.A., & Sheffield, F.D. Experiments in Mass Communication. (Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vol. 3.) Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Licklider, J.C.R. Preliminary Experiments in computer-aided teaching. In J.E. Coulson (Ed.), Programmed Learning and Computer-based Instruction. New York: Wiley, 1962. Pp. 217-239.

. . . .

POSTSCRIPT

As frequently occurs, no sooner has one finished making a speech than one encounters other materials which should have been of Contempory Psychology. In this journal, I found reviews of three books noted under the heading: Foreign Language by Programmed Learning. The review indicates that there is material in these books which would be of relevance and interest to the Seminar participants. I therefore list them for your information.

Holton, James S., King, Paul E., Mathieu, Gustave, and Pond, Karl S.; Sound Language Teaching: The State of the Art Today. New York: University Publishers, 1961. Pp. xi + 249. $5.50.

Morton, F. Rand and others; Programming of Audio-Lingual Language Skills for Self-Instructional Presentation. Selected Work-Papers Presented at the First Conference of Language Programmers, April, 1961, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1961 (Publications of the Language Laboratory, Series Preprints and Reprints, Vol. VI). Pp. xxxi + 121. $2.00

Marty, Fernand; Programming and Basic Foreign Language Course: Prospects for Self-Instruction. Roanoke, Virginia: Audio-Visual Publications (Box 5497), 1962. Pp. 69. $2.50.

I am happy to note that there are indeed some people who are attempting to combine some of the principles of Programmed Instruction in the use of the language laboratory. The reviewer notes that much of the work which has been done with the language laboratory is very close to the work which has been done in Programmed Instruction. This, more than ever, seems to indicate to me the necessity for people in both fields to be aware of the work which is being done in the other. Although I have not read any of the above mentioned three books, the review is very sympathetic and though you might wish to read the review before purchasing them, they all look well worth the small investment required.

A DISTILLATION of questions -- and answers by Dr. Wright.

Q: What do you mean by branching in a program?

Dr. Wright: This is a program in which there is a possible choice of answers and depending on which you pick, you are referred, say, to page 10 or 15 or 20. If you pick the correct answer, you will be directed, for example, to page 20, and you continue with the material. If you pick an incorrect answer, you are referred to another page. Questions are chosen to identify various types of difficulties that people might have with this material. You are branched just like a railway train. Branching is simply setting up a series of tracks that the student can travel along through the material. Some of them are longer than others. This is in contrast to the linear program with which you may be most familiar, which is step by step.

Q: Can you explain the different philosophies of linear and branching programs?

Dr. Wright: Skinner is the great proponent of linear programming. The first thing you do when you write a program is to state the desired behaviour of the student. Then you work out a series of steps through which you bring the subject, steps in which the subject is not going to fail, so that you literally shape his behaviour to his desired goal.

Crowder, on the other hand, looked at programming as communication between teacher and child. Crowder sets up a series of questions and with these questions he is talking to the student. The student, by his answer, is actually indicating, "I didn't understand this page, and the part I didn't understand is this part," according to the answer he makes. And then Crowder is replying, "Well, if you didn't understand that part, I suggest you think of this." The philosophy is entirely different.

Q: What are desirable features in a tape recorder?

Dr. Wright: I would suggest these: First of all, you have to have some device so that the master tape won't be erased; you have to have a multiple channel. Second, you have to have some electronic spotting in the tape. You are quite familiar with slide projectors harnessed with tape recorders where a little electronic beap or timer can advance your tape. I think you will need that built in. You will have to have spacers of some kind for your materials. Just as you have a space to write in, you have to have a space to respond in. This is a time slot in the tape. We have no machine with which to compare the student's voice with the ideal voice and say "That's right" or "That's wrong." We have machines which can make a comparison but they can't cope with all the variations, the individual tones and volume etc. What you need is something in which, when you push the button, the tape pulls back. You could have a dial you could set so it will jump back five or 10 seconds and maybe what you would want to do is set your machine up so that the student makes his response and pushes the button and the tape jumps back, gives the right answer and the student's answer. Or it can repeat the student's answer immediately to him followed by the right answer. This might be a little more physically practical. If it is a technological problem, I think that all you have to do is sit down and spell out: "What do I want? I want something that will do this, this and this." Then you can easily find out how much it will cost to make it because technologically we can do it. All you have to find out is whether it is financially possible.

Q: Are there programs being made by school boards, and if so, where?

Dr. Wright: There is at least one that I saw in languages. It is in the Denver Public School system which made one in Spanish. Making a program is a very time-consuming and expensive process. It wouldn't be at all abnormal to have a teacher working full-time for a year on a program and, strange as it may seem, some school boards are not too enthusiastic about investing this amount of teacher time on the construction of programs. Consequently, the bulk of it is being done in industry and in the armed services and some is being done commercially, of course, which is where the 123 programs come from. I saw one magazine which lists possibly a dozen projects undertaken in preparing programs and learning materials for French. But two paragraphs down the first sentence is, "None of the major programs are currently available." This, I am afraid, is what happens to a lot of work which is being done by the school boards. A lot of the experimental work on program materials may be available later but it is not available now.

Q: We want our students to be able to read, write, speak and understand a language. Which of these goals would be most applicable to programmed learning?

Dr. Wright: Programming, as it exists today, appears to have been most easily done in the skills of reading comprehension, and writing as an outgrowth of reading comprehension. The seeking of comprehension is quite possible following some of the techniques which I have been suggesting. There is no particular reason, for instance, why you can't tape something on film but there you are getting into cost problems when you start getting into some of your other media. Programming is expensive. You have to revise your material again and again.

If you have language laboratories, however, I see no reason why they can't be adapted.

Much has been done in the language laboratory today which is much like a program though not quite, because it is being done with a slightly different philosophy. I think that it is in this area that you might find that you can apply programming techniques and philosophy by identifying your end goal very, very specifically and then defining the steps. If you are talking in terms of contrasts there will have to be time given to contrasts and you must work through them step by step.

I would like to point out, without beating any drums for any firm, but just because those two are available, that you look at the Encyclopaedia Britannica material. You will see that they have a series of comparisons which they are asking the student to make. Now it is a written response, but they are attempting to teach discrimination. I have never used the material so I don't know how effective it is.

I think that you could even apply these principles to television. If you are going to have the students responding to the television screen verbally, there is no particular reason why you can't again stage it in a series of simple, well-planned steps.

If you attempt to go into programming materials I would suggest that you need two things. You need a person who knows the content very well. Then you need somebody who knows a programmer to talk about the newly-arriving special media and who is going to sit down and worry about the steps.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

On the final day participants broke into groups to discuss two main topics: "What needs to be done about Modern Language courses in the schools?" and "What needs to be done about Texts, Testing and Teacher Training?".

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE ABOUT MODERN LANGUAGE COURSES IN SCHOOLS?

GROUP I

Chairman: Miss Florence Bradford
Recorder: Mr. Roger Malboeuf

I AIMS:

1. To provide a "bilingual" society in Canada.
2. To provide a means of communication where there are ethnic groups in local areas.
3. To provide a nucleus of "linguists" for international relationships.
4. To provide cross-cultural benefits.

II CONTENT:

1. On a national level -- priority should be given to English and French -- they should be compulsory.
2. On a provincial level -- additional languages should be taught according to local needs.

III TIME:

1. To be determined by needs to put over an adequate program.

IV NEEDS:

1. Some articulation is needed between elementary school, high school, and university.
2. There should be sequential continuity within program.
3. We would like to see co-ordination down-up/up-down between educational bodies.
4. Provincial authorities should accept responsibility for articulation/co-ordination and authorize "bilingualism".

GROUP 2

Chairman: Mr. André Douesnard
Recorder: Mr. C.T. Teakle

We discussed the continuity of the program and the oral approach. We felt that it is very necessary that there should be continuity, or integration of the program between elementary and high schools.

WE RECOMMEND -- that some action be taken so that the work of local committees be passed-down to some central committee so that we shall benefit by the work that is being done in the different parts of the country.

This may be done, perhaps, by the various departments of education. Alternatively, we have another recommendation.

WE RECOMMEND -- that the Canadian Teacher's Federation undertake the co-ordination of a Canadian Modern Language Association which could act as a centre for gathering and distributing such information.

So far as the language is concerned, we discussed only the teaching of English and French. We felt in our group that these are the languages we would be teaching in our schools.

WE FELT IT DESIRABLE -- that the first approach should be oral and that it should be started as early as possible in the different provinces. This means, of course, that we must have competent teachers or other means of teaching, e.g. teaching aids.

WE SUGGEST -- that the CTF gather from the different provincial associations of teachers, information about their successful programs.

GROUP 3

Chairman: Miss Lorraine LeBlanc
Recorder: Mrs. Marjorie Dover

PURPOSES:

In some areas it has been suggested that language should be taught to retain the native language rather than to learn a second language.

ATTITUDE OF CHILDREN:

It was pointed out that in some areas of British Columbia where children were forced to take French on the Grade five level, there was definite resistance as it was apparently preferred to have the children learn English rather than retain their native tongue. This, of course, is not always the case and in some parts of British Columbia there has been greatest cooperation where compact French-speaking communities are concerned.

An overriding consideration, the group agreed, should be that where there are two major languages in our country, these two languages should be taught.

International relations can be established only when you are thinking of the culture of the country concerned.

The question was asked, why not more school broadcasts in languages? It was felt that this Seminar should try to promote television language programs on a national level, rather than just provincial.

We suggest that a campaign might be undertaken to overcome hostility and attitudes of resistance. Resistance is not always due to hostility but rather to an economic pressure. Very often prestige makes up for lack of numbers. A minority group is sometimes economically dominant and thus puts pressure on larger groups.

There is no general agreement on the optimum age at which a second language can be begun. It must be looked at from administrative, psychological and neurological points of view. Economic demands may determine the age. (If a child is later going to find it necessary to use a second language, the earlier he starts learning it, the better.)

We agree that the earlier we start cultivating attitudes in children, the greater success we are going to have in teaching the language.

One argument for leaving the introduction of French to a later age is the lack of competent teachers. This may be overcome by in-service training. We suggest that we must keep in mind at all times attitude, particularly that of the teacher. There must be enthusiasm. We agree that the program must be oral -- aural in early stages.

ARTICULATION:

Learning of languages is a sequential affair, not one of areas. Therefore, there is much greater need for liaison than there is with other subjects. It is agreed that more must be done to bridge the gap between elementary and high school.

MAJOR AIMS IN TEACHING LANGUAGES:

We agree that the spoken language must precede written work. There is a pilot project in Manitoba -- an oral French program being carried on in a terminal academic course on the Grade 10 level, to be continued in Grades 11 and 12. It appears to be proving successful. Testing is done orally.

Mention of this brought up the problem -- if this idea is to be carried out on the high school level, will universities accept it? Our feeling is that if oral French is introduced on a lower level there should be time on the upper levels for written work and that universities should be asked to base their entrance examinations on both oral and written work.

WHAT
SHOULD
BE DONE
ABOUT
TEXTBOOKS?

by
Miss Florence Bradford
Supervisor of French
Ottawa Public School Board

I hope it is not considered bad form if I sometimes mention our own textbooks used in the Ottawa Public Schools but I imagine that was the reason I was chosen, because I am sure a lot of you would be more qualified to speak on textbooks in general. But we, as you have probably discovered, found that the textbooks available are not suitable and not adequate for our purposes.

So, the first thing you have to decide is what is a good textbook, and decide its characteristics.

If you can't find such a book, write it yourself. The point is, does it adequately fill the purpose for which it is intended? If you want to teach oral French you have to have a book that is suitable for oral French. If you are going to lean over heavily on grammar you have to have one that is full of grammar, with exercises and so on.

No matter which text you have, you need variety of material.

Now one thing we found about texts when we started our program in 1930 was that the books seemed to be written by people with no knowledge, or very little knowledge, of what went on in an elementary school or in an elementary child's mind. This was the first thing that brought us to the conclusion that we would have to write our own books. You need something which will not only interest your pupils but which stimulates them to continue their studies.

As to the nature of the material in this book, of course it should be of a varied nature and applicable to children of whatever age level with which it is used. Now it was our firm conviction that some books leaned over backwards to deal with subjects only related to France, while others were related only to Canada. In our opinion there should be a judicious mingling of the two and no matter which language they are studying they should, of course, study about the country of origin of the language and then relate it to whatever experience is presented to them in the present day.

There must be a proper selection of language vocabulary and it must be at a suitable level for whichever grade with which it is being used. We found most of the early books subjected children to very difficult tests and were quite beyond their comprehension.

There should also be a continuity, not only within the book, but in the different books they are going to use. Now this is a problem that my high school friends repeat to me often and they say that in the courses which they are expected to teach there is not sufficient continuity in the textbooks. Of course we wanted continuity between our books in elementary school and those used in high school. It has been said to me on various occasions from different sources around Ottawa that the present authorized texts are slanted toward the districts of Ontario where French is not used at all and that something should be done to dove-tail these books.

The textbook must be not too hard for the pupil, yet not too easy. If you have a book that you put in the hands of Grade nine or 10 children and it is on an elementary level, it is not going to appeal to those children. You have a problem of subject matter as well as difficulty in presentation. Friends who teach in the high schools, which I haven't done for a few years, tell me the grammar texts are quite often too difficult or too easy.

Another thing, sometimes the author's vocabulary is of one level, Shakespearean you might say, and the words in everyday use are at another level and there is not sufficient coordination between the two. It is one thing that teachers have to combat all along the line.

Furthermore, even in the older grades, they find that the description in the stories and the textbooks are not too interesting. There is more material for the nine and 10 level than there is for the 13. In our own books for our little children we have got over this problem because we have written our own to make a continuity.

WHAT
SHOULD
BE DONE
ABOUT
TEACHER TRAINING

by
Harvey R. Barnes
Head, Modern Languages Department
Sir Charles Tupper Secondary School
Vancouver

This might take the form of a list of things rather than a connected argument of any kind. I think we have reached agreement here on one thing and that is that no matter at what level any language or any kind of teaching is done, one most effective thing is the enthusiasm with which the teacher goes about the job. Perhaps this has a greater bearing in our field than in many others. I would like to make that point one. How will teacher training lastingly convince the beginning teacher of the necessity for this enthusiasm? Does it have to be there in the first place, or can this be cultivated?

Another point is that we seem to have been splitting the sequential teaching of a language into at least two different levels, the primary and the secondary, and the area that seems to have most attention here is the primary -- chiefly because of the new developments in going down the grades in order to find a beginning point for teaching a language. What kind of teaching methods must be adopted here? What is the actual training in, and what is the amount of knowledge of a language needed by the teacher himself? This seems to be a very important point.

Faced with a shortage of teachers, as most provinces are as language training is started earlier, is there any short cut to producing, in a short period of time, enough qualified teachers to undertake the job? Some people seem to think so. For example, I would like to quote from a Brown University article: "One very common error is the notion that only a teacher with a wide range of conversational ability can conduct oral practise in the classroom. This is a commonly made error. This error reflects a mistaken concept of the function of a teacher in a beginning foreign language class. His function is to help the pupils establish reliable, correct, firmly-practised habits in the language, not to chat with them in that language on a wide range of topics. To build these habits, the teacher must guide the pupils to a thorough control of a very limited part of the foreign language as a firm, secure foundation for their later, more rapid progress. The establishment of new language habits requires intense and well-planned practise on a severely limited body of vocabulary and sentence levels. In this development of his pupils' new foreign language habits, the teacher has three indispensable roles. First, he serves as a model for his pupils' imitations. For this role he needs an accurate control of the pronunciation and the sentence structures of the materials his pupils are to learn. Those and nothing more. He need not, and he should not, use any more of the foreign language in his pupils' hearing. His knowledge of French, German, Spanish, Russian or Swahili for purposes of tape teaching these particular pupils is precicely and exclusively the exact French, German, Spanish, Russian or Swahili sentences which he is using as teaching materials."

The article goes on to two other points -- that of the teacher's role in the classroom as an evaluator of the pupils' progress, and as a conductor of the orchestral procedure of drill in the class. But the first point is the main one.

Surely, there is an answer here possible in in-service training as well as in pre-preparatory upper-graduate or post-graduate teacher training. In-service training might take us part of the way toward solving this problem.

Another main point would be this: that really nowhere in the country can you find a provincial Department of Education that says, "If you teach a second language you must have such and such qualifications." If a Department permits a certain program in a district, then the board says, "We've got to find a good teacher." We want teachers who are fluent. This is the big feature a board wants.

Can we not write down, or at least establish for ourselves, some standard that is expected by ourselves personally or of anyone who is teaching a language and insist that this be entered as a consideration in the certification of the teacher?

WHAT
SHOULD
BE DONE
ABOUT
TESTING?

by
Dr. Floyd G. Robinson
Research Director
Canadian Teachers' Federation

A realistic discussion of testing problems must begin by recognizing that testing serves several broad functions. One of these functions, which is particularly important in the early stages of the teaching of any skill is that of diagnosis for the purpose of remedial action. For example, one objective of modern language teaching seems to be the attainment of correct pronunciation in the foreign language. Consequently the teacher, who is inevitably forced to instruct by group methods, can hardly assume that any technique will guarantee a mastery of the ability to produce the sound segments of the foreign language. The degree of mastery for each desired language skill should be assessed for each student and remedial treatment applied when necessary.

Another function of testing is to assess the general progress of the pupil, usually for the somewhat questionable purpose of assigning grades. Of course a battery of diagnostic tests could serve as an achievement test -- if we could agree as to how we should weight the various scores obtained. On the other hand, few achievement tests are sensitive enough to be used for diagnosis.

The diagnostic and achievement rating functions of testing are, of course, of interest to every language teacher. But testing serves other functions which ought to be the concern of people who would promote second language teaching. There is, for example, the problem of predicting the success which a student will have in language study, so that those who cannot achieve to a satisfactory level can be screened out. One of several complications in the problem is the fact that one set of skills -- such as elementary oral comprehension and production -- do not appear to be markedly related to general ratings of intelligence, while complex reading skills on the other hand do correlate positively and at a significant level with I.Q. These correlations, and other evidence, would appear to cast a good deal of doubt on the advisability of basing admission requirements to elementary school second language programs on I.Q. scores or on I.Q.-related criteria, a practice which seems to be common in Canada (according to the Purvis report).

Another function of testing should be to attempt to substantiate the claims made regarding the supposed beneficial effects of studying a second language. For example, Robert Lado, in his book Language Testing (4), claims that the study of a second language will do these things:

(a) contribute to the ability to think freely, constructively, and accurately

(b) give an appreciation of, and feeling for, the creativeness of one's own language

(c) provide insight into a foreign culture

(d) provide insight into one's own culture

(e) increase understanding and true tolerance of minority groups.

This may sound like an impressive list, but it is actually quite skimpy in comparison with the claims made, say, for "modern mathematics" (in short, this discipline is supposed to render almost unlimited benefit to the mind, body and soul). If a sardonic remark were in order, one might note that if the supposed benefits of the study of various fields of education were even partially realized, man would surely be a much more noble creature than he is found to be in practice.

Let me now turn briefly to a few problems which complicate second language testing. I would be the first to admit that the language teacher must have a much greater degree of proficiency in her field before she can test in a reliable and valid way, than, say, the mathematics teacher. The reasons for this are fairly direct. In the first place, if one accepts Lado's theory of second language learning, then the whole strategy of constructing language tests must follow from an extensive linguistic analysis of the foreign and native languages in question and the determination of the learning problems which will arise when the student mistakenly attemps to transfer to the new language, the patterns which have become habitual with him in his native language. Now even if Lado's thesis can be disputed or the structural analysis can be performed for the teacher by an expert, it still seems reasonably clear that the teacher would have to possess a high degree of proficiency before she could assess the student's skill in the production of sound segments, intonation and rhythm which together comprise pronunciation.

A second difficulty in language testing, of course, is that tests involving an integrated skill such as speaking would seem to require individual testing over a fairly extensive range of situations. Such testing would require the expenditure of a vast amount of time (which the teacher simply does not possess). One of Lado's contributions has been to devise what he calls "partial production" tests. These are paper and pencil tests of the mastery of the elements and integrated skills of language. Many of these tests are cast in multiple choice form for rapid, objective scoring. For example, a teacher who might normally test the student's mastery of the use of stress (that is, the use of variations of pitch, duration and loudness) by laboriously listening to the student read or converse -- a time-consuming and not too reliable technique -- could employ one of Lado's tests and have the student use a numbering system to indicate the stress which he would use in pronouncing a given word or sentence.

There are certain problems and limitations inherent in the partial production technique, as for example establishing whether the score obtained on such a test actually provides a valid measure of the skill in question. Another difficulty is that not all complex language skills can be attacked this way (for example, reading).

I would like to conclude by discussing briefly the topic proposed, that is, "What should be done about testing?" As a start I would say that since at the present time testing still seems to require a good deal of language skill on the part of the teacher, one might well argue that an adequate testing program must wait the solution of the problem of getting higher qualified teachers into the language field.

Meanwhile one thing which can be done is to bring pressure upon teacher training institutions to offer courses in measurement to all teachers. Some of our surveys have indicated that courses which deal in any comprehensive way with testing concepts and techniques are pretty well limited to the graduate level -- surely a disgraceful and inexcusable state of affairs. I would suggest that a measurement course for language teachers might consist of two parts: (a) a general treatment of the standard concepts of measurement and (b) a course in test construction which deals with the kinds of tests proposed by Lado and others.

It also seems quite obvious that the very wide differences in the grade levels at which second language courses begin in Canada pretty well precludes the possibility of establishing valid national or even provincial age or grade norms of validity. The obvious implication here is that individual school systems will have to engage in a good deal of local norm construction if they hope to undertake a systematic testing program.

It is also apparent that a great deal more basic work must be done in the field of language testing. There seems little doubt that the work of Lado, particularly in the construction of partial production tests, should be validated and extended. The problem of prediction must also be pursued with considerable vigor and some attempt must be made to incorporate the tests of the components of language skill into a general psychometric model such as Guilford's three-dimensional model of the intellect (2). Psychometric theory has advanced to the point where the class of test constructors who do not attempt to determine the factorial structure of their tests in terms of such a model must be regarded as somewhat suspect.

And finally, dropping my role as a statistical analyst and speaking as a parent, I would say that there are still a number of basic questions which must be pursued before parents can commit their children without qualms to a program of second language teaching. For example, can we take time away from the present curriculum for the study of a second language and still expect children to maintain or even accelerate their rate of learning in the other basic skills? Is there a possibility that the proponents of second language teaching may be exaggerating somewhat the non-utilitarian claims for this field? And finally and most intriguingly, I suppose, what are parents to make of the controversy, which seems to have lined up good men on both sides, to the effect that the learning of a second language in some way blocks the realization of the child's potential in his native tongue or his capacity to reason logically? I am not foolish enough to believe that testing and research will provide final answers to these questions, but they surely must be the concern of any group which expects a place in the school curriculum.

. . . . . .

REFERENCES

1. Cronbach, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. 475 p.

2. Guilford, J.P., and Merrifield, P.R. The Structure of Intellect Model: Its Uses and Implications. Studies of Aptitudes of High-Level Personnel No. 24. Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, the University of Southern California. April 1960. 27 p.

3. Harris, Chester W., and Liba, Marie R. (eds.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third edition. New York: MacMillan, 1960. 1564 p.

4. Lado, Robert. Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests: A Teacher's Book. London: Longman's, 1961. 389 p.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE ABOUT TEXTS, TESTING and TEACHER TRAINING?

GROUP I

Chairman: Miss Bradford
Recorder: Mr. Malboeuf

TEXTBOOKS:

1. Texts should be consistent with the audio-lingual approach.
2. There should be -- (a) more free reading;
   (b) less translation;
   (c) no English texts.
3. We need "scramble books" -- offering drills on the programmed teaching techniques.
4. We would like to see more articulation (integration) so that texts will dove-tail.
5. We need material for academic/commercial and general courses.
6. We need supplements to course of study where texts used may not clearly indicate areas to be studied.

TEACHER TRAINING

1. If good teachers are available there should be no worries about texts.
2. Language teachers need more training. We recommend
   (a) that teachers' colleges offer courses in French and in language teaching or methods;
   (b) in-service training in summer schools, such as Trois Pistoles, where the direct method is used. This results also in more enthusiasm for the language, having spent time in a French milieu.

3. Teachers should have supervision (teachers who help, encourage in work and in organization).

4. Interprovincial exchanges would help.

5. Teachers should be encouraged to teach at various grade levels from one year to another -- elementary and high school grades.

TESTING:

1. External exams should reflect to a larger extent our interest in audio-lingual teaching.

2. The group would like to receive:

   (a) material related to second language learning and I.Q.

   (b) a bibliography on testing.

GROUP 2 :

Chairman: Mr. Douesnard
Recorder: Mr. Teakle

TESTING:

We started on oral testing and had a splendid discussion but we have no conclusions. As for the matter of whether we should use tests to determine who should be allowed to take a modern language, we thought that for modern languages there should be no test because the skills involved are an important factor here and it depends on what you intend to teach. We think that everybody should be given the opportunity of taking modern languages in the elementary school but more than one course should eventually be established to allow for different skills and what the child is going on to. In other words, that might lead to an all oral course even to the high school level for some pupils.

TEACHER TRAINING:

All we could say was that where teacher training was being well done, it should be improved. Where it wasn't being done it should be encouraged. We need to establish special courses to help get through this emergency. At the normal schools students should be able to practise the use of mechanical equipment because some teachers are scared stiff even to try to use it.

TEXTBOOKS:

The only conclusion we came to was that at the elementary school level the background of the textbooks should be Canadian and should go on to a French background at the high school level.

GROUP 3

Chairman: Miss LeBlanc
Recorder: Mrs. Dover

TEACHER TRAINING:

Should we have teachers trained in one specific area and then have them forced to teach another? Or should they be given general training? It was felt that before we could discuss this we should consider the point that teachers should be trained regarding grade levels.

Some felt we should go on record as advocating certification in subject areas. There was some opposition to this with the feeling that the teacher's certificate to teach is the important thing because the teacher's desires or inclinations toward a certain subject very often change following experience in the classroom.

We agree that a second language teacher should be given an oral examination before being granted a license to teach such language.

We suggest that there should be more scholarships enabling teachers to go abroad for study on post-graduate level.

Should we wait until we have specialist language teachers, or should we give the teachers presently in the classroom in-service training?

Have we the assurance that media such as tapes, records, etc., can be used by the mediocre teacher in the lower grades to assist her in presenting a language orally?

Manitoba, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have set up courses in their teacher training programs in which teachers receive special training in teaching a second language.

It was felt that the matter of exchanging teachers within our own country was a difficult matter because of the differences in certification. We suggest that it would be preferable to have the exchange between teachers of Canada and those of European countries.

We generally felt that it is much better to have an itinerant specialist teacher visit a class once a week as in the Ottawa plan than to have the classroom teacher attempt to carry the entire program on her own. It was felt, however, that specialist training doesn't always insure a better job than the ordinary classroom teacher can do. Again it was stressed that interest and enthusiasm are key factors in the teaching of a second language.

Do we favor linguistic science for teachers? We suggest that any teacher would profit through the reading of such books as that written by Pollitzer.

TEXTBOOKS:

We felt that we should have a greater freedom of choice of textbooks. This stemmed from discussion concerning the teacher who apparently is unable to do a good job due to her aversion to the text insisted upon in the course of studies. Also, we feel that we should adhere as much as possible to texts prepared by Canadians.

TESTING:

Our short discussion on this subject centered on Dr. Robinson's statement that it has sometimes been felt that learning a second language blocks a child's capacity to develop his own tongue. Unfortunately, we were unable to continue this discussion to any length due to pressure of time but many felt that learning a second language will provide enrichment rather than prove a limiting experience.

SECTION C

Modern Language Programs in Canadian Schools 171
Tables 175
Participants 191
Observers 197

MODERN
LANGUAGE
PROGRAMS
in CANADIAN
SCHOOLS

Material Prepared
by
The Research Division
Canadian Teachers' Federation

It was decided by the Planning Committee of the Seminar that, in order to obtain current data on modern language teaching in Canada, questionnaires be sent to the curriculum directors of the provincial departments of education and to the Seminar participants. The results of the two surveys were originally compiled for use at the Seminar as two separate documents, entitled Analysis of Questionnaire to Participants in the CTF Seminar on Teaching Modern Languages, and Modern Language Programs in Canadian Public Schools, with Special Reference to Secondary Schools. In the interests of space and the avoidance of repetition, the major results of the two surveys have been combined for inclusion in this report.

It should be noted that the surveys were designed to supplement and up-date a recent summary of modern language programs in Grades 1 to 9 which was already available in Neil M. Purvis' thesis, A Survey of Second Language Programs for English-Speaking Children in Grades One Through Nine in Canadian Schools. (This document was reproduced for distribution to participants.) Thus some of the tables refer only to the situation in Grades 10 to 13.

The tables dealing with provincial regulations are based primarily on replies from curriculum directors in all ten provinces, coupled with supplementary information provided by the participants and by Mr. Purvis' thesis. The replies relating to participants' views are based on a return of 47 questionnaires. As a number of participants held positions other than teacher or supervisor in a local public school district, the tables on programs in various districts were based on an analysis of 31 questionnaires. These replies provided a fairly generous sample of larger centres in Canada. Only those questionnaires received by the "cut-off" date of November 13 were used in the analysis.

Tables 1 to 6 provide provincial data on the following aspects of modern language programs:

1. Grade levels corresponding to various divisions and the official language of instruction in each province.
2. Grades in which a second language is required or permitted, and languages required or permitted.
3. Instruction time devoted to a required second language.
4. Instruction time devoted to an optional second language.
5. Proportion of students at each grade level studying an optional second modern language.
6. Provincial regulations governing the qualifications required to teach a second language.

Table 7 summarizes language programs now in effect in the various districts represented by the participants, and provides, as well, some indication of intention to expand or abridge the program now in effect. As a partial measure of the extent of the district programs, information on the language programs required or permitted by the Department of Education regulations has been included for each province. It should be pointed out that the data may not in all cases be complete for a district, as it appeared that in some cases participants answered in terms of their own special interests, rather than for the whole district.

Table 8 provides data on significant teaching techniques and methods being used in the various centres. This table shows, in particular, that the direct method is widely used, and that language laboratories are being introduced in a number of centres.

Table 9 reports the frequency of mention of various aspects of language teaching in which participants expressed an interest or had done some research. Teacher training was the most frequently mentioned, followed by textbooks, testing and linguistics.

Table 10 records the frequency of mention of problems in modern language teaching considered urgent by the participants. Only two problems, lack of competent teachers and the need to stress oral fluency, were mentioned more than ten times.

Both surveys requested estimates of the proportion of teachers who were not qualified (according to provincial regulations) to teach second languages -- in the provinces and local districts respectively. So many of the replies from the departments of education indicated that no data were available that there seemed to be no point in compiling the replies. Moreover, most of the provincial regulations (see Table 6) were so lacking in specific requirements for modern language teachers (only three mentioned a minimum number of university courses in the subject) that estimates of unqualified teachers would indicate only general certification standards in the province, rather than specific deficiencies in the training of language teachers.

It appeared that the same situation held true in the local districts. However, it is of interest to note that a number of participants provided subjective estimates of the extent to which they felt the teachers in their district lacked suitable training. The general concensus appeared to be that anywhere from 1 to 90 percent of the teachers in various districts were not adequately prepared to teach a second language.

A final point to be mentioned is that since Purvis' thesis dealt only with second language programs for English-speaking students, a special questionnaire was sent to the Catholic Quebec authorities requesting additional information. Some of this additional information is summarized below:

1. In Quebec, all French-speaking students must study English, all English-speaking students must study French. No other modern language programs are offered in the Catholic schools at present. Thus, questions of selection and election do not arise (cf. Purvis' thesis, p. 34).

2. The reply noted that some problems of articulation between the language programs in the elementary and secondary grades are encountered, but did not describe them in detail.

3. The reply noted that the normal schools offer special courses to prepare teachers of modern languages in the elementary and secondary schools (cf. Purvis, p. 35).

4. Responsibility for establishing the modern language curriculum rests with the Catholic Committee (cf. Purvis, p. 36).

Table 1. Grade Levels Corresponding to Various Divisions and Extent to Which English Is the Official Language of Instruction

Province	Elementary	Junior High	Secondary or Senior High	Official Language of Instruction	Remarks
B.C.	1-7	8-10	11-13	English	
Alta.	1-6	7-9	10-12	English	In a few schools French may be used in Grade I if students are French-speaking
Sask.	1-8	...	9-12	English	
Man.	1-6	7-9	10-12	English	
Ont.	1-8	...	9-13	English (in schools attended by English-speaking pupils)	French is the official language of instruction in schools attended by French-speaking students up to Grades 3 or 4. Thereafter, both French and English are used as languages of instruction
Que.Prot.	1-7	...	8-12	English	French is language of instruction in about 6 schools, and in special classes in a few other schools
Que.Cath.	1-7	...	8-12	French English	
N.B.	1-6	7-9	10-12	English &French*	Mathematics & Science in grades 7-12 in French schools taught in English, other subjects in French
N.S.	1-6	7-9	10-12	English	
P.E.I.	1-8	(7-10) in a few schools	9-12	English	French is a language of instruction, along with English, in about 4% of schools. These are Acadian schools
Nfld.	1-8	...	9-11	English	

*Approximately 40-45 percent of the New Brunswick population is French-speaking.

Table 2. Grades in Which a Second Modern Language is Required or Permitted by the Department of Education, and Languages Required or Permitted

Province	Language	Grades in Which Required of All Students	Grades in Which Optional
B.C.	French	8[a]	9,10,11,12,13
Alta.	French	None	7,8,9,10,11,12
	German	None	10,11,12
	Ukrainian	None	11,12
Sask.	French	None	6,7,8,9,10,11,12
	German	None	9,10,11,12
	Ukrainian	None	9,10,11,12
Man.	French	None	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
	German	None	7,8,9,10,11,12
	Ukrainian	None	10[b]
Ont.	French	None	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13
	English	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13	None
	German	None	10,11,12,13
	Russian	None	10,11,12,13
	Spanish	None	10,11,12,13
Que.Prot.	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	1,2
	German	None	10,11,12
	Spanish	None	10,11
	English		
Que.Cath.	English	5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	None (because compulsory)
	French	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
N.B.	French	5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	3,4
	English	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	2
N.S.	French	None	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
	English	None	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
	German	None	10,11,12
P.E.I.	French	8,9,10,11,12	7, 13
	English	None	7,8,9,10,11,12,13
	German	None	11,12,13
Nfld.	French	None	5,6,7,8,9,10,11
	German	None	9,10,11
	Spanish	None	9,10,11

[a] Exclusions are allowed through consultation between principal and parent, but about 90 percent participate.

[b] Will be extended to Grade 11 in 1963-64, to Grade 12 in 1964-65.

Table 3. Number of Minutes of Instruction Time Per Week
Devoted to a Second Modern Language Required
by the Department of Education

Province	Grade												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
B.C.								120					
Alta.													
Sask.													
Man.													
Ont.			75	..	225	225	225	225	..	..	..	..	..
Que.Prot.			100	150	150	150	150	190	200	200	200	240	
Que.Cath.					100	100	120	150	150	150-250	150-250	150-300	
N.B.							90	90	135	180	180	180	
N.S.													
P.E.I.								120	120	120	175	175	
Nfld.													

.. No data

Table 4. Number of Minutes Instruction Time per Week Devoted to a Second Modern Language Permitted by the Department of Education

	Grade												
Province	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
B.C.									200	200	200	200	200
Alta.							75-185	75-185	75-185	190-200	190-200	190-200	
Sask.							60	60	175	175	175	175	
Man.				100-150	100-150	100-150	90	135	180	198	198	297	
Ont.			60	60	60	100	100	150	200	200	240	240	240-280
Que.Prot.	50	50											
Que.Cath.													
N.B.													
N.S.							120	120	120				
P.E.I.											175	175	
Nfld.							90	90	180	180	180		

Table 5. Proportion of Students at Each Grade Level Above Grade 9 Studying an Optional Second Modern Language

Province	Grade				
	Language	10	11	12	13
B.C.		..*	..	..	..
Alta.	French	60%	60%	55%	
	German		3	3	
	Ukrainian		1.5	1.5	
Sask.	French	65%	60%	60%	
	German	6	5	5	
	Ukrainian	2	2	2	
Man.	French	..	61%	47%	
	German	..	15	11	
Ont.	French	88%	50%	50%	66.6%
	German			4	9.0
	Russian				.5
	Spanish				1.7
	Italian				3.3
Que.Prot.		very few			
Que.Cath.					
N.B.	French	...	60%	60%	
N.S.	French	75%	66%	60%	
	German	5	5	5	
P.E.I.	German	...	7%	7%	
Nfld.	French	60%	54%		

*Data not available because it is not mandatory that students take a specific course in a specific year. However, about 60 percent of students enrol in the University Program and would therefore be studying a language for at least two years.

Table 6. Provincial Regulations Governing the Qualifications Required to Teach a Second Language

Province	Grade	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
B.C.		Certification not based on subjects to be taught. Local authorities are expected to employ, in the secondary schools, teachers with a 5-year university degree, a major in the language, and oral competence.			
Alta.		Special certificates not required. Local authorities are expected to appoint only well-qualified teachers.			
Sask.	10 11 12	Standard Professional Professional	1 2 2		
Man.	10 11 12	First A & complete Arts II First A & complete Arts III Collegiate Certificate	2 2 2		
Ont.	10 11 12 13	High School Ass't High School Ass't High School Ass't H.S. Specialist	2 2 2+ 2+		oral fluency oral fluency oral fluency oral fluency
Que.Prot.*	10 11	Class I Class I			
Que.Cath.		Certification not based on subject to be taught.			
N.B.		Certification not based on subject to be taught			
N.S.		Certification not based on subject to be taught			
P.E.I.		Certification not based on subject to be taught			
Nfld.		Certification not based on subject to be taught			

(a) Regular certificate. (b) Number of university courses in the second language. (c) Special courses beyond regular certificate. (d) Special competencies.

*A recent survey by the Research Committee on Specialist Qualifications of High School Teachers indicated that the number of university language courses taken by high school teachers was as follows: no courses: 38.5%; 1-4 courses: 35.1%; 5-8 courses: 15.1%; 9 or more courses: 11.2%.

Table 7. Second Modern Language Programs in Districts Represented by Delegates to the Seminar, and Current Plans for Extending or Abridging These Programs

Province	Centre	Languages Offered	Grades in Which Offered	Plans to Extend or Abridge the Current Program
B.C.	Vancouver	French German Spanish	6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13 9,10,11,12,13 9,10,11,12,13	French program under revision provincially, bringing emphasis on oral proficiency. Present Grade 8 is first year of the revised program.
	Vancouver	French German Spanish	8,9,10,11,12,13 9,10,11,12,13 9,10,11,12	To extend in secondary school. There has been some reduction in elementary programs.
	Victoria	French German Spanish	8,9,10,11,12,13 9,10,11,12 9,10,11,12	None
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	8,9,10,11,12,13	
Alta.	Calgary	French German	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 11,12 (Available in 2 schools)	Experimental T.V. French program to selected Grade 4 classes is being continued in same schools in Grade 5 and will be given to the same schools in Grade 6 next year. As soon as money is available this program will be given to all Grades 4-6 classes in Calgary. (May go into effect in September, 1963.)
	Edmonton	French Ukrainian	4, 7,8,9,10,11,12 10,11,12	An experimental T.V. program is now in effect in Grade 4.
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French German Ukrainian	7,8,9,10,11,12 10,11,12 11,12	

Table 7. Continued

Province	Centre	Languages Offered	Grades in Which Offered	Plans to Extend or Abridge the Current Program
Sask.	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French German Ukrainian	6,7,8,9,10,11,12 9,10,11,12 9,10,11,12	
Man.	Winnipeg	French German Ukrainian	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 10,11,12 10	1. Conversational French (Grades 4-6) at present taught only in major work classes. It is planned to extend this to all Grades 4-6 classes. 2. Ukrainian will be taught throughout high school.
	Winkler	German	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	Plans to extend and strengthen German language instruction Grades 1-8.
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French German Ukrainian	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 7,8,9,10,11,12 10	
Ont.	Cornwall	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13	Plans to extend. Separate and Public School Boards are collaborating for purpose of establishing a common course of studies in the elementary schools.
	*Etobicoke	French German Spanish Russian	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13 11,12,13 13 11	
	*Forest Hill	French German Spanish	5,6,7, 9,10,11,12,13 11,12,13 11,12,13	The French program in the elementary schools will reach Grade 8 next year, and in subsequent years the secondary school program will have to be suitably modified.

*Toronto district.

Table 7. Continued

Province	Centre	Languages Offered	Grades in Which Offered	Plans to Extend or Abridge the Current Program
Ont. (cont'd)	Hamilton	French	9,10,11,12,13	Extension of direct method in French.
		German	11,12,13	
	*North York	French	8,9,10,11,12,13	Tentative extension plans.
		German	11,12,13	
		Spanish	11,12,13	
		Russian		
	Ottawa Public (Elem. only)	French	2,3,4,5,6,7,8	None
	*Ottawa Separate	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13	Hope to extend teaching of French to Grade 2.
	*Scarborough	French	9,10,11,12,13	Possible extension of French to Grade 8 and downward.
		German	11,12,13	
		Spanish	11,12,13	
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13	
		German	10,11,12,13	
		Spanish	10,11,12,13	
		Russian	10,11,12,13	
		English	7,8,9,10,11,12,13	
Que.Prot.	Montreal	French	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	French specialists have been introduced in some elementary schools. English as a second language will be extended to Grade 11.
		German	11	
		Spanish	10,11	
		English	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	
	Pointe Claire	French	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	Shall extend to teaching of other subjects in French as soon as we find suitable teachers.

*Toronto district.

Table 7. Continued

Province	Centre	Languages Offered	Grades in Which Offered	Plans to Extend or Abridge the Current Program
Que.Prot. (cont'd)	St. Anne de Bellevue	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11	Possible extension of French to Grade 12.
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
		German	10,11,12	
		Spanish	10,11	
		English		
Que.Cath.	Montreal	French	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
		English	5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
	Quebec	French	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	Teaching of English as a second language is obligatory from Grade 6 and may become obligatory from Grade 7.
		English	5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
	Trois Rivières	English	4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	Plans to abridge.
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
		English	5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
N.B.	Moncton	French	5,6,7,8,9,10,11, 13	
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
		English	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	

Table 7. (Continued)

Province	Centre	Languages Offered	Grades in Which Offered	Plans to Extend or Abridge the Current Program
N.S.	New Germany	French	7,8,9,10,11,12	Grade 9 German is a pilot program.
		German	9,10,11,12	
	Meteghan River	French	7,8,9,10,11,12	None
		English	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
		English	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	
		German	10,11,12	
P.E.I.	Charlottetown	French	3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13	Hope to introduce oral French in Grade 1 or 2 before long.
		German	11	
		Spanish	13	
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	7,8,9,10,11,12,13	
		English	7,8,9,10,11,12,13	
		German	11,12,13	
Nfld.	St. John's	French	5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12	Introduction of French into grade schools is being encouraged.
	Dep't of Ed. Requires or Permits	French	5,6,7,8,9,10,11	
		German	9,10,11	
		Spanish	9,10,11	

Table 8. Significant Teaching Methods and Aids Being Used for Modern Language Instruction in Districts Represented by Delegates to the Seminar

Teaching Method or Aid	British Columbia		Alberta		Manitoba		Ontario	
	Vancouver	Victoria	Calgary	Edmonton	Winnipeg	Winkler	Cornwall	Etobicoke*
Cleveland Plan								X
Direct Method	X		X		X			X
Films	X							
Filteau-Villeneuve								
Language Laboratory	X		X	X	X			X
Mauger-Gougenheim							X	
Oral-aural approach	X	X	X					
Programmed instruction								
Radio	X					X		
Records			X					
Slides	X							
Tan-Gau							X	
Tape-recorders	X		X					
Television			X					

*Toronto district.

Table 8. Continued

Teaching Method or Aid	Ontario					Quebec Protestant		
	Forest Hill*	Hamil-ton	North York*	Ottawa Public	Scar-borough*	Montreal	Pointe Claire	St.Anne de Bellevue
Cleveland Plan								
Direct Method	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Films						X		
Filteau-Villeneuve						X		
Language Laboratory			X		X	X		
Mauger-Gougenheim								
Oral-aural approach						X		X
Programmed instruction								
Radio								
Records						X		
Slides								
Tan-Gau								
Tape-recorders	X					X		X
Television								

*Toronto district.

Table 8. Continued

Teaching Method or Aid	Quebec Catholic			New Brunswick	Nova Scotia		P.E.I.	Nfld.
	Montreal	Montreal	Quebec	Moncton	New Germany	Meteghan River	Charlotte-town	St. John's
Cleveland Plan								
Direct Method		X	X		X	X		X
Films								
Filteau-Villeneuve	X		X					
Language Laboratory			X					X
Mauger-Gougenheim								
Oral-aural approach		X	X					
Programmed instruction	X							
Radio							X	
Records								X
Slides								
Tan-Gau								
Tape-recorders		X	X				X	
Television								

Table 9. Aspects of Modern Language Teaching in Which the Participants Are Particularly Interested or Have Done Some Research

Aspect	Frequency of Mention
Teacher training, pre-service and in-service	22
Textbooks	14
Linguistics	10
Testing	10
Methods	8
Curriculum	6
Language labs, tape recorders	4
Teaching languages in elementary grades	3
Aims	1
Articulation	1
Motivation	1
Programmed instruction	1
Teaching adult immigrants	1
Teaching other subjects in French	1

Table 10. Participants' Viewpoints As to the Most Urgent Problems in Modern Language Teaching Today

Problem	Frequency of Mention
Lack of qualified teachers	26
Developing oral fluency as well as ability to read and write	14
Research in methods	4
Deciding on aims of modern language teaching	2
Making modern language teaching practical rather than academic	2
Teacher training in modern linguistic procedures	2
Aid to enable teachers to study foreign languages abroad	1
Articulation of elementary and secondary programs	1
Finding suitable textbooks	1
Motivation (of teachers and students)	1
Need to teach English to Eskimos	1
To convince school boards that under careful supervision, classroom teachers can teach oral French in the elementary school	1
To make French television, radio and films readily available	1
Community attitudes	1

PARTICIPANTS

NAME	POSITION and/or ADDRESS	SPONSORING ORGANIZATION
Mr. W. H. Agnew	Citizenship Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Ottawa, Ontario.	Department of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Clifford Andrews	85 Grenfell Avenue, St. John's, Nfld.	Newfoundland Teachers' Association
Mr. Harvey R. Barnes	2888 Highbury Street Vancouver 8, B.C.	(Advisory Group)
Mr. J. Ross Beattie	1447 Beauséjour, Sherbrooke, Quebec.	Canadian Education Association
Mr. Jacques Beauchamp	3737 Sherbrooke St. East, Montreal 36, Quebec.	Montreal Catholic School Commission
Mr. J. J. Bergen	Box 488, Winkler, Manitoba	Manitoba Teachers' Society
Major E. A. Blais	Directorate of Military Training, "A" Building, Department of National Defence, Cartier Sq., Ottawa, Ontario.	Department of National Defence
Mr. M. A. Bonneau	Manitoba Teachers' College, Winnipeg 29, Manitoba.	Canadian Education Association
Miss Florence E.Bradford	Supervisor of French, Ottawa Public School Board, 330 Gilmour Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	(Advisory Group)
Miss Florence Brennan	3794 Marcil Avenue, Montreal 28, Quebec.	Provincial Association of Catholic Teachers
Miss Elizabeth Brownrigg	140 Cumberland Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	Ontario Teachers' Federation
Dr. Donald Buchanan	Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 6000 Fielding Avenue, Montreal 29, Quebec.	Canadian Education Association
Mr. J. B. Burnie	Forest Hill Board of Education, 730 Eglinton Avenue W., Toronto 10, Ontario	Canadian Education Association

Mr. Albert J. Burns	10852 Bruxelles Avenue, Montreal N., Quebec.	Corporation des Instituteurs et Institutrices catholiques du Québec
Miss Velma Carter	Walter Murray Collegiate, Preston Avenue, Saskatoon, Sask.	Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation
Mr. J A. Comeau	Meteghan River, Digby Co., N S.	Canadian Education Association
Mr. F S Cooper	Superintendent of Public Schools, 2472 Eglinton Avenue E., Scarborough, Ontario	Canadian Association of School Superintendents and Inspectors
Dr. Raymond F. Costello	598 Côte Ross, Quebec 10, Quebec.	Canadian Education Association
Mr. Victor Dallaire	531 Radisson Street, Three Rivers, Quebec.	Corporation des Instituteurs et Institutrices catholiques du Québec
Mr. W. G. Devitt	Dept. of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Blackburn Bldg., Sparks Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources
Mr. André Douesnard	28 Ile de Mai, Ste. Therèse W., Quebec.	(Advisory Group)
Mrs. Marjorie Dover	124 St. Peters Road, Parkdale, P.E.I.	Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation
Mr. Albert Filteau	105 Brookfield, Montreal 16, Quebec.	Montreal Catholic School Commission
Dr. R. C. Gardner	Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Western Ontario London, Ontario.	(Speaker)
Dr. Robert Gauthier	473 Wilbrod Street Ottawa 2, Ontario.	(Speaker)
Mr. K E. Gilliss	766 King Street Fredericton, N.B.	New Brunswick Teachers' Association
Mrs. Bernard Grigg	314 Gleeson Avenue, Cornwall, Ontario	Ontario Teachers' Federation

Mr. A. Hacikyan	Faculty of Education, University of Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Quebec.	Canadian Association of Professors of Education
Mr. E. Harford	Belgian Embassy, 168 Laurier Avenue E., Ottawa, Ontario.	(Speaker)
Flt.-Lieut. S. Hassay	Chief Instructor, Joint Services Language School, 297 Dupuis Street, Eastview, Ontario.	Department of National Defence
Mr. James M. Hewitt	1460 St. Foy Road, Quebec, P.Q.	L'Association Canadienne des Educateurs de Langue Française
Mr. A. F W. Hodgins	Ontario Department of Education, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario.	Canadian Education Association
Miss Jeannette Hulek	Chilton Books, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.	(Demonstrator)
Dr. Joseph C. Hutchinson	Interim Secretary, Department of Foreign Languages, U. S. Office of Education, Washington 25, D.C.	National Education Association (Speaker)
Mr. E. A. Hutton	Hamilton Board of Education, P. O. Box 558, Hamilton, Ontario.	Canadian Education Association
Mr. Paul Jodoin	Teacher, Glebe Collegiate Institute, Ottawa, Ontario.	(Demonstrater)
Brother J. P. Keane	Brother Rice High School, St. John's, Nfld.	Newfoundland Teachers' Association
S/L W. Kereliuk	Joint Services Language School, 297 Dupuis Street, Eastview, Ontario.	Department of National Defence
Miss Dorothy J. Kidd	982 Graham Blvd., Apt. 3, Town of Mount Royal, Quebec	Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers of Quebec.
Mr. Michael F. Lafratta	Etobicoke Board of Education, 540 Burnhamthorpe Road, Etobicoke, Ontario	Canadian Education Association

Major A. B. Laver	1201 Castle Hill Crescent, Ottawa 5, Ontario.	Canadian Psychological Association
Miss Lorraine LeBlanc	63 Alma Street, Apt. 12 Moncton, N.B	(Advisory Group)
Mr. R. G. LeBlanc	7708-95th Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta.	Alberta Teacher's Association
Mr. John E. R. Lloyd	Lecturer in Russian, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.	(Speaker)
Prof. W. F. Mackey	Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, Laval University, Quebec City, P.Q.	(Speaker and Consultant)
Commander E. C. Mahon	Director of Naval Education, No. 8 Temporary Building, Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario.	Department of National Defence
Mr. Roger A. Malboeuf	Macdonald High School, Macdonald College, Quebec.	Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers of Quebec.
Miss M. Patricia Maybury	1039 Riverview Avenue, Verdun, Quebec.	Canadian Teachers' Federation
Mr. S. E. McDonald	107 Ruskin Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	Canadian School Trustees' Association
Mr. Arthur J. Montague, O.B.E.	British Council Liaison Officer, 77 Metcalfe Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	(Speaker)
Mr. Harrison S. Murray	31 Alexander Avenue, Moncton, N.B.	New Brunswick Teachers' Association
Mr. G. Nason	Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Teachers' Federation, 444 MacLaren Street, Ottawa, Ontario	
Miss Florence Nichols	c/o Etobicoke Board of Education, 540 Burnhamthorpe Road, Etobicoke, Ontario.	Ontario Teachers' Federation
Dr. E. M. Oppenheimer	Department of Modern Languages, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.	Canadian Association of University Teachers

Mr. L. H. Outram	69 Donn Avenue, Stoney Creek, Ontario.	Ontario Teachers' Federation
Mrs. Elsie R. Pain	2959 West 44th Avenue, Vancouver 13, B.C.	British Columbia Teachers' Federation
Mrs. Sarah Paltiel	Supervisor of French, Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 6000 Fielding Avenue, Montreal 29, Quebec.	Canadian Association of School Superintendents and Inspectors
Mr. Douglas Parker	3831 Merriman Drive, Victoria, B.C.	British Columbia Teachers' Federation
Mr. Tom Parker	1551 South Park St., Halifax, N.S.	Nova Scotia Teacher's Union
Mrs. Margaret Rainsberry	3 Banbury Road, Don Mills, Ontario.	Ontario Teachers' Federation
Miss E. F. Redmond	662 Lyndale Drive, Winnipeg 6, Manitoba.	Manitoba Teachers' Society
Mr. Norman Riddiough	Executive Assistant, Canadian Teachers' Federation, 444 MacLaren Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	
Prof. André Rigault	Director, University Language Laboratory, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.	(Speaker)
Dr. F. G. Robinson	Research Director, Canadian Teachers' Federation, 444 MacLaren Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	
Mrs. Gladys Rutherford	Executive Assistant, Canadian Teachers' Federation, 444 MacLaren Street, Ottawa, Ontario.	
Sister Mary Peter	St. Anne's Convent, R. R. 2, Morel, P.E.I.	Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation
Sister Marie-Cyrille	Green Valley, Ontario.	Ontario Teachers' Federation
Miss Helen M. Smith	2706-10th Street S.W., Calgary, Alberta.	Alberta Teachers' Association

Mr. W. D. Sproule	Head, Dept. of Modern Languages, Kenner Collegiate Vocational Institute, Peterborough, Ontario.	Canadian Association of School Superintendents and Inspectors
Mr. Spencer Stanutz	1525 Sandgate Cresc., Clarkson, Ontario.	Canadian Education Association
Dr. J. C. Tassie	Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario	Canadian Association of University Teachers
Mr. C. T. Teakle	501 St. John's Road, Pointe Claire, Montreal 33, Quebec.	Canadian School Trustees' Association
Prof. R. W. Torrens	Head, Department of Romance Languages, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.	Canadian Association of University Teachers
Mrs. Marguerite Travers	Teacher, Hopewell Avenue Public School, Ottawa, Ontario.	(Demonstrator)
Mr. Hector Trout	317 Lake Crescent, Saskatoon, Sask.	Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation
Dr. B. E. Walker	Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta	Canadian Association of Professors of Education
Mr. Harald Weiland	Box 91, New Germany, Lunenburg Co., N.S.	Nova Scotia Teachers' Union
Mr. François Weymuller	Cultural Counsellor, French Embassy, Ottawa, Ontario.	(Speaker)
Mr. H. L Willis	1323 Laperriere Avenue, Ottawa 3, Ontario	Canadian Education Association
Dr. E. N Wright	Toronto Board of Education, 155 College Street, Toronto 2B, Ontario.	(Speaker)
Prof. Jean-Paul Vinay	Director, Department of Linguistics, University of Montreal, Montreal, Quebec.	Canadian Linguistics Association (Speaker)

OBSERVERS

NAME	POSITION and/or ADDRESS
Miss Doris Beer	Editorial, Ryerson Press, 299 Queen Street West, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. André Belleau	National Film Board - Montreal
Mr. D. V. Bradstreet	Sales Manager, Ambassador Books Limited, 370 Alliance Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. R. B. Britton-Foster	Executive Editor, Copp Clark Publishing Co. Limited, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. G. L. Carter	E. B. Films, 151 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. Wm. Clare	Sales Manager, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 833 Oxford Street, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. T. V. Dobson	The Copp Clark Publishing Co. Limited, 517 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. C. Raymond Duplantie	W. J. Gage Limited, 1500 Birchmount Road, Scarborough 4, Ontario.
Mr. Guy Ferland	Reporter, La Presse, 7 West St.Jacques, Montreal, Quebec.
Mr. Chas. Fitzsimmons	British Book Service, 1068 Broadview Avenue, Toronto 6, Ontario.
Dr. W. T. Ross Flemington	Director of Education, External Aid Office, 75 Albert Street, Ottawa, Ontario.
Mr. Carmen Fraser	Jack Hood School Supplies, 91-99 Erie Street, Stratford, Ontario.

Mr. Glenn B. Guest	Manager, Text-Film Division, McGraw-Hill Company, 253 Spadina Road, Toronto 4, Ontario.
Mr. Carl Heimrich	Editor, School Book Department, Macmillan Company of Canada, 70 Bond Street, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. John Henry	Thompson Products Limited, St. Catharines, Ontario.
Mr. Jack Hutton	Education Columnist, The Toronto Telegram, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. Robert Kilpatrick	Editor & Assistant Manager, School Book Division, Longmans of Canada Limited, 191 Stibbard Avenue, Toronto 12, Ontario.
Mrs. Laure Krupka	Lecturer, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Ontario.
Mr. Guy Lachappelle	Director, A-V Service, Le Centre de Psychologie et de Pedagogie, 260 W. Fillon Street, Montreal 10, Quebec.
Mr. A. Lafonde	Manager, Education Equipment Division, Edwards of Canada Limited, 5165 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, Quebec
Mr. Richard Lee	W. J. Gage Limited, 1500 Birchmount Road, Scarborough 4, Ontario.
Mr. E. Lurion	Administrator, Educational Electronics, RCA Victor, Montreal, Quebec.
Mr. John M. McAdam	Sales Agent, Ginn & Company, 35 Mobile Drive, Toronto 16, Ontario.

Miss Irene McCordick	Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited, 791 St. Clair Avenue West, Toronto 10, Ontario.
Mr. Ivan Marier	Centre de Psychologie et de Pedagogie, 260 West Fillon Street, Montreal 10, Quebec.
Mr. R. W. W. Robertson	Director of the Editorial Program, Clarke, Irwin & Company Limited, 791 St. Clair Avenue West, Toronto 10, Ontario.
Mr. Albert Saint-John	Canadian Education Association, 151 Bloor Street West, Toronto 5, Ontario.
Mr. J. Bascom St. John	Education Writer, The Globe and Mail, Toronto 1, Ontario.
Mr. Mark J. Savage	McClelland & Stewart Limited, 25 Hollinger Road, Toronto, Ontario.
Mr. S. Gordon Scott	General Manager, The House of Grant (Canada) Limited, 29 Mobile Drive, Toronto 16, Ontario.
Mr. J. André Valade	Canadian Regional Manager, Encyclopedia Britannica Press, Britannica House, 151 Bloor Street West, Toronto 5, Ontario.
Mr. C. A. Winter	Branch Manager, Dictaphone Corporation - Ottawa, 118 Holland Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario.
Mr. Harry Southworth	Dictaphone Corporation - Toronto 204 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Ontario.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Canadian Teachers' Federation wishes to thank the publishers and the manufacturers of electronic equipment for their displays of textbooks, language laboratories and other teaching aids, which helped to make the Seminar a success.